SENATE.

Tuesday, February 28, 1911.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock and 50 minutes a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

THE JOURNAL.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceed-

ings of Monday, February 27.
Mr. KEAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. If the reading of the Journal should be dispensed with, would that

comply with the unanimous-consent agreement?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks it would,

Mr. KEAN. Then I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I object, simply for the reason that I want an opportunity for all Senators to be present, and some may not now be here.

Mr. KEAN. I withdraw my request, Mr. President, The VICE PRESIDENT. The request is withdrawn. The Secretary will continue the reading of the Journal.

The reading of the Journal was resumed.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President-

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin intend to object? The Chair was about to state the request of the Senator from Arkansas, but if the Senator from Wisconsin intends to object the Chair will not state it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not intend to object, Mr. President, if I am certain of having a parliamentary question settled

to my satisfaction.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state his parlia-

mentary question.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It occurs to me, Mr. President, that a unanimous-consent agreement to dispense with the reading of the minutes of the previous meeting changes a unanimous con-sent agreement which provided that a vote should be taken after the Journal had been read. If that is true, it seems to me it ought not to be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks it would not

change the agreement.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If there is any doubt about it, I object. The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests that if the reading of the Journal be dispensed with some action will have been taken before the vote is had on the joint resolution. That The Chair thinks to dispense with the further reading is all. of the Journal would not change the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If there is any doubt about that the easiest and quickest way is to object, and also for the reasons stated by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Bacon].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana objects. The Secretary will continue the reading of the Journal.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the Journal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Journal as read will stand approved.

ELECTION OF SENATORS BY DIRECT VOTE.

Mr. KEAN. Let us have the regular order, Mr. President. The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 134) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the joint resolution, which, without objection, the Secretary

will again report.

Mr. NELSON. There is an amendment printed in the joint resolution. I do not think I have offered it. I withdraw the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the joint resolution as it will be voted upon.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That in lieu of the first paragraph of section 3 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States, and in lieu of so much of paragraph 2 of the same section as relates to the filling of vacancies, the following be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the

States:

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

"When vacancles happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of elec-

tion to fill such vacancies: Provided, That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election, as the legislature may direct.

"This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the joint resolution.

Mr. BACON obtained the floor.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President-

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. BACON. I yield to the Senator from Idaho. Mr. BORAH. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BACON. I desire to make an inquiry as to the parliamentary situation. As I understand, the joint resolution has not been passed from the Committee of the Whole into the Senate

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No.
Mr. BACON. And the agreement to vote imports that the Senate shall take up the joint resolution in the situation in which it is found and proceed to its conclusion without debate. I do not understand that it dispenses with any of the regular

parliamentary procedure.
The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair's understanding differs from that of the Senator from Georgia. The Chair's understanding is that the vote shall at once be taken upon the

passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. BACON. I will state that the object I have is this: According to the regular parliamentary procedure the joint resolution, resting as it now does in the committee, would be, by the usual formula of the questions, transferred to the Senate, and when it reaches the Senate the question would be upon the adoption of amendments which had been agreed to in

Committee of the Whole. It is with that view, desiring myself to offer an amendment, that I make the inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks that the question now is on the passage of the joint resolution in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement; that all the prior actions, through committee, and so forth, are assumed to have

been taken, and the question now is upon the passage.

Mr. BACON. Of course I would not at this stage endeavor to take issue with the Chair on the subject. I just desire to say that I should not like for it to be adopted as a precedent without dissent, because I do not think it is in accordance with the practice of the Senate in that regard. I think that under no interpretation heretofore has it ever been recognized that a matter pending in the Committee of the Whole could be voted upon as it can be in the House-the rule in the House, I know, is that way, but it is a very different rule and a very different practice here.

I want to say that I am not in any manner going to trespass upon the ruling of the Chair, but I wanted to say that my purpose was to offer this amendment, and I am going to ask unanimous consent that I may offer it. I understand there is an amendment of a grammatical character which the Senator from Idaho will want to ask to have made, and possibly, by unanimous consent, we might be allowed to vote upon this as a part of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks that any such request would be a modification of the unanimous-consent

agreement

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is true.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Which the Senate has invariably The Chair thinks it can not be done. The Secrerefused to do. tary will call the roll.

Mr. BACON. There undoubtedly can be no modification of a unanimous-consent agreement so far as to displace the order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks that the order is that the vote shall be at once taken without debate, and that if debate were now permitted it would be a modification of the order.

Mr. BACON. I want to say for myself that at the time the consent was given, I supposed it was the usual consent which is always with us to vote upon the bill and amendments then offered, or upon the joint resolution, as it may be, and the amendments.

I will say, in brief, that the amendment I wanted to offer is simply this: After the words-

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof—

Provided, That the Congress shall have power to prescribe the times, places, and manner of holding such elections in any State the legislature of which fails or refuses to prescribe such times, places, and manner.

Ralley

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CULBERSON (when Mr. Frazier's name was called). The Senator from Tennessee is unavoidably absent on account of a death in his family. If he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. BACON (when Mr. TERRELL's name was called). My colleague [Mr. Terrell] is detained from the Chamber necessarily by personal illness. If my colleague were present he would vote

The roll call was concluded, and resulted as follows:

		YEAS-54.
Claulea	A ml-	Ta Fallatta

Balley	Ciarke, Ark.	La Follette	Smith, Md.
Beverldge	Culberson	McCumber	Smith, Mich.
Borah	Cullom	Martin	Smith, S.C.
Bourne	Cummins	Nelson	Stephenson
Bradley	Curtis	Newlands	Stone
Briggs	Davis	Nixon	Sutherland
Bristow	Dixon	Overman	Swanson
Brown	du Pont	Owen	Taylor
Burkett	Frye	Paynter	Thornton
Burton	Gamble	Perkins	Warner
Carter	Gore	Piles	Watson
Chamberlain	Gronna	Rayner	Young
Clapp	Guggenheim	Shively	
Clark, Wyo.	Jones	Simmons	
	N/	YS-33.	
Bacon	Dillingham	Lodge	Scott
Bankhead	Fletcher	Lorimer	Smoot
Brandegee	Flint	Money	Taliaferro
Bulkeley	Foster	Oliver	Tillman
Burnham	Gallinger	Page	Warren
Burrows	Hale	Penrose	Wetmore
Crane	Heyburn	Percy	Wetmore
Depew	Johnston	Richardson	
Dick	Kean	Root	
DICK			
	NOT	VOTING—4.	
Aldrich	Crawford	Frazier	Terrell

The VICE PRESIDENT. Upon this question the year are 54, the nays are 33. Two-thirds not having voted therefor, the

nays have it and the joint resolution is not passed. Mr. CRAWFORD subsequently said: Mr. President, I rise

to a matter of personal privilege.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As the Senate well knows, I left here this morning at quite a late hour. I went to my apartment and I did my very best to reach here in time to vote on the special order this morning, but was unable to get a car. I did not reach here until about two minutes after the roll call was closed.

I desire to state that had I been present I would have voted for the joint resolution, but I was unavoidably absent on account of what I have said. I understand that my vote would not have saved the joint resolution, which I very much regret.

CONVEYANCE OF MAIL MATTER BY PRIVATE EXPRESS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster General, stating, in response to a resolution of the 17th instant, that there have not been for many years, nor are there now, frequent, continuous, and systematic violations of section 181 of the Criminal Code of the United States, effective January 1, 1910, etc. (S. Doc. No. 843), which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

LAWRENCE M. SIZER.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 27th ultimo, copies of all papers, charges, etc., in the matter of the dismissal from the service of Lawrence M. Sizer, formerly a clerk in the post office at Seattle, Wash. (S. Doc. No. 845), which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

THE IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor submitting an estimate of appropriation for inclusion in the sundry civil appropriation bill to complete the investigation and compilation of the report relative to the conditions of employment prevailing in the iron and steel industry of the United States, etc. (S. Doc. No. 844), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. JOHNSTON presented the credentials of John Hollis BANKHEAD, chosen by the Legislature of the State of Alabama a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1913, which were read and ordered to be filed.

Mr. FLETCHER presented the credentials of NATHAN P. BRYAN, appointed by the governor of the State of Florida a

Senator from that State from the 3d day of March, 1911, until the next meeting of the Legislature of Florida, which were read and ordered to be filed.

Mr. MARTIN presented the credentials of Claude Augustus Swanson, appointed by the governor of the State of Virginia a Senator from that State from the 3d day of March, 1911, until the next meeting of the Legislature of Virginia, which were read and ordered to be filed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by W. J. Browning, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 10457) to amend section 6 of the currency act of March 14, 1900, as amended by the act approved March 4, 1907.
The message also announced that the House had passed the

joint resolution (S. J. Res. 145) providing for the filling of a vacancy which will occur on March 1, 1911, in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the

concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 30292. An act to change the name of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service to the Public Health Service, to increase the pay of officers of said service, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution authorizing the President to appoint a competent person to investigate the manufacture of white phosphorus matches and report to the next session of

Congress.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a resolution authorizing the Speaker of the House to cancel his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 145) providing for the filling of a vacancy which will occur on March 1, 1911, in the Board of Regents in the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress, and that the Clerk of the House be directed to return the joint resolution to the Senate and request the Senate to reenroll the joint resolution as amended.

REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 145) providing for the filling of a vacancy which will occur March 1, 1911, in the Board of Regents in the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress, which was, in line 8, to strike out "Virginia" and insert "the city of Washington."

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate concur in the amend-

ment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented resolutions adopted at the second annual convention of the Jewish Community of New York City, N. Y., favoring the ratification of a new treaty be-tween the United States and Russia, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Citizens' Association of Takoma Park, D. C., praying for the adoption of a system of universal transfers on the railroads in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Co-

lumbia.

GUGGENHEIM. I present a concurrent resolution passed by the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, ratifying the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and

referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed

in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate concurrent resolution 3.

Concurrent resolution ratifying the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

Whereas both Houses of the Sixty-first Congress of the United States of America at its first session, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit:

"A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution, namely:
"'ARTICLE XVI. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportion-

ment among the several States and without regard to any census or enumeration

enumeration: ""
Therefore be it
Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, That the
said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of
America be, and the same is hereby, ratified by the General Assembly of
the State of Colorado.
That certified copies of this preamble and joint resolution be forwarded by the governor of this State to the President of the United
States, Secretary of State of the United States, to the Presiding Officer
of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the United States
House of Representatives.

Stephen R. Fitzgarrald,
President of the Senate.
George McLachlan,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
Approved this 20th day of February, A. D. 1911.
John F. Shafroth,
Governor of the State of Colorado.

Filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Colorado on the 21st day of February, A. D. 1911, at 5.43 o'clock p. m. Recorded in book —, page —.

JAMES B. PEARCE, Secretary of State, By Thomas F. Dillon, Jr., Deputy.

STATE OF COLORADO, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, State of Colorado, 88:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, State of Colorado, ss:

I, James B. Pearce, secretary of state of the State of Colorado, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of senate concurrent resolution No. 3, by Senator Garman, concurrent resolution ratifying the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, which was filed in this office the 21st day of February, A. D. 1911, at 5.43 o'clock p. m., and admitted to record. In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Colorado at the city of Denver this 23d day of February, A. D. 1911.

[SEAL.]

JAMES B. PEARCE, Secretary of State,

JAMES B. PEARCE, Secretary of State, By Thomas F. Dillon, Jr., Deputy.

Mr. BURNHAM presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of New Hampshire, praying that an investigation be made into certain existing conditions in the Territory of New Mexico before the ratification of the constitution thereof, which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. KEAN presented petitions of Lincoln Post, of Newark; of John M. Wheeler Post, of Montclair; of Uzal Dodd Post, No. 12, of Orange; and of Major Dandy Post, No. 143, of Perth Amboy, all of the Department of New Jersey, Grand Army of the Republic, in the State of New Jersey, praying for the passage of the so-called old-age pension bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of H. B. Cornwall, of Prince ton, N. J., praying for the ratification of the proposed reciprocal agreement between the United States and Canada, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Angle Manufacturing Co., of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against any change being made in the rate of postage on periodicals and magazines,

which was ordered to lie on the table. He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Hackensack, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immi-

Mr. CARTER. I present a joint memorial adopted by the Twelfth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, which I ask may be printed in the Record and referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 4.

Petition to Congress to enact such legislation as will be necessary for the establishment of pleasure grounds on the irrigation districts now laid out, and also naming Fort Shaw Military Post as one of said

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress of the United States assembled:

the United States assembled:

The Great West Country Life Commission, with headquarters at Spokane, Wash., a branch of the organization instituted recently by the executive department of the Government of the United States with a view of inaugurating a movement for the improvement of country-life conditions, has for its object the removal of unrest among the farmers and their families on account of their Isolation from urban enjoyment, and especially has for its object the improvement of rural conditions so as to add to the attraction of farm life, and in furtherance of this purpose has formulated a plan for the establishment of pleasure grounds to be known as the Country Life Commission grounds, on which shall be erected halls, schoolhouses with suitable athletic fields, plenic grounds, and such like auxiliaries, thus affording means for education and amusements such as are furnished through the grange hall, harvest feast, and picnics of the Order of the Patrons of Husbandry, the grounds thus to be dedicated to embrace an area of from 10 to 20 acres, as occasion may demand.

The State of Montana, desirous of increasing the fascinations of farm life, gives its unqualified indorsement to this movement, and therefore Resolved, That we, the Twelfth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, the senate and house concurring, do hereby petition the Congress of the United States for the passage of legislation whereby super-

vising engineers of the several reclamation projects within this State shall be empowered to lay out such grounds for pleasure parks—of from 10 to 20 acres in every 20,000 acres of reclaimed land—and that the title to such parks so established shall be conveyed to a board of trustees to be appointed by the governor of the State, the title so vested to be held in trust.

And we further petition that that portion of the old military post of Fort Shaw, abandoned for garrison and Indian school purposes and now unused, embracing about 60 acres of land, and described as follows:

Lots 11 and 12, section 2; and that portion of the north one-half northeast one-fourth section 11, township 20, north of range 2 west, lying north of the Great Northern Sun River line right of way, the north one-half northeast one-fourth of section 11 being divided east and west by the Great Northern Sun River line right of way, be constituted a pleasure park for the reclamation districts known as the Fort Shaw unit of the Sun River reclamation of the Fort Shaw Military Post grounds for pleasure-park purposes as the buildings thereon are adobe and are not in condition to be moved, and the ground on which the buildings stand is valueless for agricultural purposes and the territory adjacent to the post is thickly peopled.

Resolved further, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state to the honorable Secretary of the Interior and our Senators and Representative in Congress, with the request that they use every effort within their power to secure the enactment of such legislation as is needful to effectuate the ourposes herein indicated.

W. R. Allen, President of the Senate.

W. W. McDowell, Speaker of the House.

Approved February 17, 1911.

Filed February 17, 1911.

A. N. YODER, Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, State of Montana, ss:

I. A. N. Yoder, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of Senate joint memorial No. 4, petitioning Congress to enact such legislation as will be necessary for the establishment of pleasure grounds on the irrigation districts now laid out, and also naming Fort Shaw Military Post as one of said parks, enacted by the twelfth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by Edwin L. Norris, governor of said State, on the 17th day of February, 1911.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 17th day of February, A. D. 1911.

[SEAL.]

A. N. Yoder, Secretary of State.

Mr. NIXON presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Reno.

Mr. NIXON presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Reno, Nev., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called par-cels-post bill, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Federation of Citizens' Associations of Washington, D. C., favoring continu-ation of the present public school system, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the International Pulp and Paper Mill Workers' Unions of Fort Edward, N. Y., remon-strating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal agreement between the United States and Canada, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. YOUNG. I present a telegram in the nature of a memorial from the secretary of the Commercial Club of Des Moines, Iowa, relative to the consolidation of the pension agencies. ask that the telegram lie on the table and that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DES MOINES, IOWA, February 27, 1911.

Hon. LAFAYETTE YOUNG, Washington, D. C.:

Washington, D. C.:

If pension offices are to be reduced in number by the consolidation of offices, why not favor the offices located in Government-owned properties, with adequate facilities for their accommodation? In Des Moines the Government owns a Federal building worth, with grounds, three-quarters of a million, used exclusively for Federal offices and courts; also another building, worth \$500,000, exclusive of real estate, used exclusively for post office. In the first building is the pension office, using half of the second floor. The entire first floor, of over 10,000 square feet, is not now in use and is available for pension office and would afford more than twice the room now occupied, leaving ample room for courts, custom, and other Federal offices and for their extension for the next 50 years.

Commercial Club.

COMMERCIAL CLUB, GEIS BOTSFORD, Secretary.

Mr. BURTON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to further increase the efficiency of the Organized Militia, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs

Mr. ROOT presented petitions of sundry labor organizations of Albany, Amsterdam, Auburn, Buffalo, Batavia, Binghamton, of Albany, Amsterdam, Auburn, Buffalo, Batavia, Binghamton, Bridgehampton, Brooklyn, Cornwall, Elmira, Glens Falls, Geneva, Hudson, Herkimer, Ithaca, Kingston, Lake Placid, Lockport, Lestershire, Montgomery, Minaville, Manlius, New York City, Newburgh, New Rochelle, Ogdensburg, Poughkeepsie, Perry, Rochester, Rifton, Syracuse, Union Course, Utica, Waverly, Yonkers, and Valley Stream, all in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the North Side Board of Trade, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the extension of the pneumatic-tube system into the Borough of the Bronx, New York City, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. SCOTT presented a petition of the congregation of the Baptist Church of Grafton, W. Va., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the interstate transmission of racegambling bets, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Okonoko, W. Va., remonstrating against any increase being made in the rate of postage on periodicals and magazines, which was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 22270) for the relief of Amos M. Barbin, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1261) thereon.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 30281) to provide for the entry under bond of exhibits of arts, sciences, and industries, reported it

without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1262) thereon. Mr. OWEN. From the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and on my own behalf, I submit the following report to accompany the bill (H. R. 31539) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, and for other purposes. The attention of the Senate is called to the amendment proposed by me on the 25th instant relative to the rate of postage on periodicals and magazines. I move that the report be printed as Part 2, Senate Report No. 1242, submitted by me a few days ago.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 32436) making appropria-tions for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1263) thereon.

DUTY ON DISTILLED SPIRITS.

Mr. LODGE. From the Committee on Finance, I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 28626) to amend the internal-revenue laws relating to distilled spirits, and for other purposes, and I ask for its present consideration

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the infor-

mation of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3255 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by act of June 3, 1896 (29th Stat., p. 195), be amended so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 3255. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may exempt distillers of brandy made exclusively from apples, peaches, grapes, pears, pineapples, oranges, apricots, berries, plums, pawpaws, persimmons, prunes, figs, or cherries from any provision of this title relating to the manufacture of spirits, except as to the tax thereon, when in his judgment it may seem expedient to do so: Provided, That where, in the manufacture of wine, artificial sweetening has been used the wine or the fruit pomace residuum may be used in the distillation of brandy, and such use shall not prevent the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, from exempting such distiller from any provision of this title relating to the manufacture of spirits, except as to the tax thereon, when, in his judgment, it may seem expedient to do so."

Mr. HEVRURN. I should like to ask a question of the Sen-

Mr. HEYBURN. I should like to ask a question of the Senator reporting the bill. I should like to know how much revenue is involved in the exemption of the brandy made from

those articles.

Nothing is exempted. The bill will save to Mr. LODGE. the Government about \$800,000 in revenue. The Senator, of course, in the confusion did not fully get the purpose of the bill. The language in which the word "exempt" occurs is the existing law, and the exemption applies to everything except It exempts it from the rules applying to whisky and taxation. other articles.

Mr. HEYBURN. It was read amid great confusion.

Mr. LODGE. The necessity arises from this fact. The law says "exclusively," and it has been held lately that if sugar is applied to the grapes or fruit before fermentation then it is not exclusively. It would throw out of business a large number of manufacturers who have been engaged in business for more than 40 years and cost the Government about \$800,000 a year in revenue.

Mr. HEYBURN. The bill was read amid much confusion, and I caught it imperfectly, but in this day I am inclined to be rather on the watch for legislation that diminishes the revenues of the Government in one branch so that excuse may exist for changing them in another.

Mr. LODGE. This prevents a reduction of revenue.

Mr. OWEN. Let the bill be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has been once read. Does the Senator desire to have it read again?

Mr. OWEN. I do. The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection the Secretary will again read the bill.

The bill was again read.

Mr. OWEN. I should like to have a brief explanation of the

Mr. LODGE. Down to the proviso it is the existing law. The Senator will notice that in that law it says "exclusively" as applied to the brandies made from fruits. It has been recently held by the Comptroller that if sugar was used with the fruits prior to fermentation it was no longer exclusively, and that fruit brandies did not therefore come within the provision of the law. There is quite a large manufacture in certain States, which has existed for some 40 years. At the request of the Treasury Department this bill was put in, as the decision would put an end to that form of industry and would cost the Government some \$800,000 a year in revenue.

The bill has passed the House unanimously and is recommended by the department. All that is new is in the proviso, which says even if the sugar is used beforehand they can still

be classified as fruit brandies.

Mr. OWEN. I have no objection to the bill. There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TAX ON ALCOHOL.

Mr. LODGE. From the Committee on Finance, I report back favorably and ask for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 29857) to amend section 3287 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by section 6 of chapter 108 of an act approved May 28, 1880, at page 145, volume 21, United States Statutes at Large.

The Secretary read the bill; and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It proposes to amend section 3287 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by section 6 of chapter 108 of an act approved May 28, 1880, page 145, of volume 21, United States Statutes at Large, so as to read as follows:

Provided further, That alcohol or high-proof spirits withdrawn free of tax for the use of the United States, as authorized by section 3464, Revised Statutes, may be drawn off for transfer by pipes direct from the receiving cisterns in the cistern room of any distillery to closed metal storage tanks situated in the distillery bonded warehouse and transferred from such storage tanks to tanks or tank cars for shipment, upon the execution of such bonds and under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATES OF DECEDENTS.

Mr. CULLOM. From the Committee on Finance I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 17433) amending section 1709 of the Revised Statutes of the United

States. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to amend section 1709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States by the addition of the following paragraph:

States by the addition of the following paragraph:

Sixth. The Auditor for the State and other Departments shall act as conservator of such part of these estates as may be received at the Treasury, and for their protection the Secretary of the Treasury may order such effects to be sold as may consist of jewelry or other articles which have heretofore or may hereafter be received at the Treasury, and pay the expenses of such sale out of the proceeds, provided application for these effects shall not have been made by the legal claimant within two years after their receipt. The Auditor is authorized to indorse all bills of exchange, promissory notes, and other evidences of indebtedness due to such estates, and to take such steps as may be necessary for their collection. The proceeds of such sales, together with such other moneys as may be collected by him, shall be deposited into the Treasury in trust for the legal claimant, and be reported to the Secretary of State.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELECTION OF SENATORS.

Mr. BURROWS. From the Committee on Privileges and Elections, I report back favorably the bill (S. 10862) to alter the regulations respecting the manner of holding elections for Senators, which I ask may go to the calendar.

Mr. ROOT. I ask the chairman of the committee if it was

not his intention to ask for the present consideration of the bill? The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan stated that he wished the bill to go to the calendar.

Mr. ROOT. If the chairman of the committee expressed the wish that the bill should go to the calendar, I have nothing further to say; but if the Senator has no personal objection, as the bill relates to the matter of the election of Senators, I ask for its present consideration. Let the bill be read for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill just

reported by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. CULBERSON. I object, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

CLAIMS FOR LOSS OR DAMAGE TO PRIVATE PROPERTY.

Mr. BURNHAM. From the Committee on Claims, I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 10890) for the payment of certain claims for damages to and loss of private property

Mr. WARREN. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate

consideration of that bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to appropriate \$25,535.22 for payment of 200 approved claims for damages to and loss of private property belonging to citizens of the United States, Hawaii, and the Philippine Islands that have arisen previous to February 21, 1911, estimated for in House Documents Nos. 1242 and 1404, Sixty-first Congress, third ses-

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE SENATE MANUAL.

Mr. CARTER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution (S. Res. 378), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to (S. Doc. No. 846):

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be instructed to prepare a new edition of the Senate Manual, and that there be printed 4,000 copies of the same for the use of the committee, of which 200 copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents.

AFFAIRS IN ALASKA.

Mr. PILES. I submit a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 42), as follows:

42), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a joint committee of both Houses of Congress is hereby appointed, to be composed of five members of the Senate, to be appointed by the Presiding Officer thereof, and five members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker thereof; and any vacancy on the committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment. The said committee is hereby empowered and directed, by subcommittee or otherwise, to sit during the sessions or recess of Congress at such times and places as they may deem desirable, to visit Alaska and make a thorough investigation of existing conditions and of the resources and needs of that Territory, to employ a stenographer and such other assistants as may be necessary to carry out the purposes for which such committee is created.

The said joint committee shall conclude its investigation and report to the Sixty-second Congress the result thereof, together with its recommendations concerning such legislation as may be advisable regarding Alaska. The expenses incurred by said joint committee shall be paid equally out of the contingent funds of the Senate and House of Representatives upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate and of the Committee on Accounts of the House of Representatives, respectively.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present

consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. BURROWS. Let the resolution go over.
Mr. PILES. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not object to the consideration of the resolution. It is a matter of

importance, and not something of mere passing moment.

Mr. GALLINGER. Under the law the resolution will have to go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and therefore can not be acted upon now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas: A bill (S. 10896) for the relief of Lizzie E. McCord, administratrix of Moses S. McCord, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROWN:

bill (S. 10897) granting an increase of compensation to bookbinders, printers, pressmen, clerks, and laborers in the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. PENROSE submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$3,500 for the salary of the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. DU PONT submitted an amendment relative to the requirement of the 40-foot open space for fire protection at the post office at Smyrna, Del., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURNHAM submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$12,000 to pay the State of New Hampshire for land and fort in Portsmouth Harbor ceded to the United States, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was ordered to be printed and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WARREN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$25,000 for the establishment of a fish-cultural station in the State of Wyoming, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURKETT submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$10,000 to provide the necessary conduits, cables, wires, and labor in connecting the central heating, electric light, and power plant from Freedmen's Hospital to the various buildings on the Howard University grounds, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CRANE submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$2,000 to pay the Norcross Bros. Co. for certain work in remodeling the fourth floor of the Treasury Building, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TALIAFERRO submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$50,000 for the establishment of a biological and fishcultural station on the St. Johns River, Fla., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. DICK submitted an amendment proposing to settle the accounts of former postmasters who served at post offices in the various States and Territories of the United States between July 1, 1864, and July 1, 1874, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to pay the salary accounts of certain former postmasters of the State of Colorado between July 1, 1864, and July 1, 1874, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MONEY submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$5,000 for the construction of a walk from the National Military Cemetery at Natchez, Miss., to the sidewalks of that city, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was ordered to be printed and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appro-

Mr. BRADLEY submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$45,000 for the completion of the post-office building at Lancaster, Ky., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment relative to chaplains in the Navy, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on

Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BANKHEAD submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$101,938.81 in settlement of the claims of the Mobile Marine Dock Co., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$14,000, being an additional amount for the police fund of the District of Columbia, and \$7,000 for the firemen's relief fund of the District of Columbia, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment relative to the employment of substitute teachers in the public schools of the District of Columbia, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also submitted an amendment relative to the granting of leaves of absence to members of the fire department of the District of Columbia, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PAYNTER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$2,000 for the salary of one pay-roll clerk, office of the Deputy Public Printer, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

WAGES AND COMMODITIES.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 377) which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to (S. Doc. No. 847):

Resolved, That the report of the select committee of the Senate authorized to investigate and make report relative to wages and commodities, and the views of a minority, together with the hearings and appendices, be printed as a document.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

Mr. DU PONT. I present an article on Canadian reciprocity and the American farmer and manufacturer, which I ask may be printed as a document (S. Doc. No. 842).

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will inquire of the Senator from Delaware what the paper relates to?

Mr. DU PONT. It is in regard to Canadian reciprocity. I will state to the Senator that it contains a great deal of valuable information.

Mr. GALLINGER. If we go into the matter of printing editorials in the Record on Canadian reciprocity, I have a basket-ful of them against it. I suppose this paper is in favor of reciprocity. I think if the Senator could have it printed as a docu-

ment and not encumber the RECORD with it, it would be better.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understood the request

to be to have it printed as a document.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the Senator from Delaware asked for both.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair did not so understand the request. The order is that it be printed as a document.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is all right.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 30292. An act to change the name of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service to the Public Health Service, to increase the pay of officers of said service, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution authorizing the President to appoint a competent person to investigate the manufacture of white phosphorus matches and report to the next session of Congress was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 31856) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 238, 239, and 240.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 32, 33, 35, 36, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 76, 77, 82, 87, 88, 91, 92, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 103, 108, 119, 120, 122, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 130, 131, 135, 138, 139, 141, 144, 146, 153, 154, 158, 162, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 173, 174, 177, 180, 182, 183, 184, 189, 193, 194, 197, 206, 210, 212, 214, 215, 216, 217, 221, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 233, 234, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, and 249, and agree to the same 248, and 249, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert \$1,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert

\$114,086"; and the Senate agree to the same.
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "The provisions of the act approved March 15, 1898, as amended by the act approved July 7, 1898, regulating leave of absence to employees of the Federal Government, are hereby made applicable to the regular annual employees of the government of the District of Columbia, except the police and fire departments, and public-school officers, teachers, and employees"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert

\$179,810"; and the Senate agree to the same.
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "two cataloguers, at \$540 each"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-ment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert \$40,940"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert \$123,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 89 and 90, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: Transpose said amendments and insert the same on page 33 of the bill, after line 26, amended as follows: In line 8 of amendment numbered 89 strike out the word "seventy-five" and insert in lieu thereof the words "one hundred"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$65,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$130,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

"\$130,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$260,000," and on page 35 of the bill, in line 24, after the word "specifications," insert the following:

"Provided further, That whenever it shall appear to said complete the state of the same of the sam

missioners that the work now performed under contract, namely, street sweeping and cleaning alleys and unimproved streets, can, in their judgment, be performed under their immediate direction more advantageously to the District, then, in that event, said commissioners are hereby authorized to perform any part or all of said work in such manner, and to employ all necessary personal services, and purchase and maintain such street-cleaning apparatus, horses, harness, carts, wagons, tools, and equipment as may be necessary for the purpose, and of this appropriation the sum of \$40,000 is hereby made immediately available."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Interior Park: For the condemnation of land in the interior

of square 534, within the limiting lines shown on approved plans in the office of the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, and for the development of the land so acquired as an interior park: Provided, That the said land shall be condemned by a proceeding in rem in accordance with the pro-visions of subchapter 1 of chapter 15 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia within six months after the date of the passage of this act: And provided further, That of the amount found to be due and awarded by the jury in said condemnation proceedings as damages for and in respect of the

land to be condemned, plus the cost and expense of said proceeding, not less than one-third thereof shall be assessed by the jury as benefits, \$78,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$46,495"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert

"\$13,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$23,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 132, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "forty-six"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 133, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "sixty"; and the Senate agree to the same.

sert "sixty"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 136, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$940,009.50"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 145, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$536,170"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 148, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$31,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 149, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$128,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 151, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby directed to make an investigation as to the necessity of installing a high-pressure fire-service system in the business section of the city of Washington, and to report the results of such investigation to Congress at its next regular session"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 155, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Provided, That hereafter any inspector of dairies and dairy farms may act as inspector of live stock when directed by the health officer"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 156, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 68 of the bill, in line 6, strike out the word "ten" and insert in lieu thereof the word "fifteen"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 157, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "For the construction of a pound and stable, to be immediately available, \$10,000: Provided, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to build said pound and stable on public space owned or controlled by said District adjacent to James Creek Canal"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 160, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$11,740"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 161, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Deputy financial clerk, \$1,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

That the House recode from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 163, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$28,380"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 178, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 179, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert the following: "900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 185, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$840"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 186, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$27.015"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 192, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$34,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 195, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 84 of the bill, in line 16, strike out the words "four hundred and eighty," and insert in lieu thereof the words "six hundred"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 198, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$17,220"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 201, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$48.290" and the Senate agree to the same

"\$48,220"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 207, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "stableman, \$300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 208, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$6,480"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 211, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$13,930"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 218, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 22 of said amendment, after the word "workhouse," insert the following: "or in the Washington Asylum and Jail"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 219, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$48,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 236, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$80"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 237, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$80"; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. H. GALLINGER,
CHARLES CURTIS,
B. R. TILLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
WASHINGTON GARDNER,
E. L. TAYLOR, Jr.,
A. S. BURLESON,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will state that the only change in the report is that the House disagreed to the provision increasing the salaries of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. The report was agreed to.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, before the morning business closes I wish to ask that a certain portion of a letter submitted and read into the Record on the 21st day of February, 1911, be expunged therefrom. The letter is one which deals with the subject of Canadian reciprocity, and, while it contains many important and strong points on that subject, it also contains some things that ought not to have gone into the Record. The writer of that letter stated:

I am so stirred up that I can not but express my resentment.

And he carried this spirit into his letter so strongly that I think he gave vent to some expressions which, if he had con-

sidered them, he would not have cared to be spread upon the RECORD.

Mr. President, the portion of the letter which I ask to have expunged refers to Mr. James J. Hill, and it, to some extent, questions his integrity and capability. As one of the representatives of the great Northwest, I feel it incumbent upon me to say that there is no man in the whole country who has done more for the upbuilding, and for the general welfare of the entire northwestern section of this country than has Mr. Hill, and I know of no American citizen who is more patriotic, sincere, ardent, and industrious than is he, in laboring for what he considers the best interest of the country. The great irrigation project which is to make productive vast sections of the West is only one of the fruits of his careful investigations and zealous labor. The value of his studious life in bringing home to the country the rapid and worse than wasteful exhaustion of our national resources, and his instructive addresses over the whole country on the subject of increasing the fertility and productiveness of our farms, are beyond computation. While I am compelled to differ from him upon the effect of the Canadian reciprocity matter, I can not question, nor do I think any other person can justly question, the patriotism of his purpose or his integrity in compiling and presenting facts and figures to the public.

Mr. President, this letter was received by my colleague, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Gronna], and was immediately presented without much time for careful reading. I am certain that had he read over carefuly every paragraph of it, he would have bluepenciled certain portions before he asked that the letter should go into the Record. The Record should contain no personality or vitriolic accusation of any character against any person. I was going to suggest to my colleague that he himself, inasmuch as he asked for the reading of the letter, should request that the portion to which I have referred be expunged; but, inasmuch as he is not present in the Chamber at this time, I can say that I have talked with him upon the subject, and that I am certain that he agrees with me, and that he would say to the Senate were he present that this portion inadvertently printed into the Record ought to be expunged.

I will therefore ask, Mr. President, that on page 3040, second column, of the Record of February 21, after the word "us," in the eleventh line of the tenth paragraph of the letter, all that follows, down to and including the word "rot," be stricken out, and also that all but the first four lines of the second paragraph from the bottom of the column be expunged, so that the paragraph will close with the word "way." I ask that the order may be made at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota? The Chair hears none, and the matter referred to will be expunged from the RECORD.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, Executive clerk, announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On February 27, 1911:

S. 608. An act for the relief of Charles T. Gallagher and Samuel H. Proctor;

S. 7640. An act for the the relief of James M. Sweat;

S. 7804. An act for the relief of David Jay Jennings; and S. 10015. An act for rebuilding and improving the present light and fog-signal station at Lincoln Rock, Alaska, or for building another light and fog-signal station upon a different site near by.

On February 28, 1911:

S. 5432. An act to authorize the city of Seattle, Wash., to purchase certain lands for the protection of the source of its water supply; and

S. 10318. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant further extensions of time within which to make proof on desert-land entries in the counties of Benton, Yakima, and Klickitat.

REPORT OF PHILIPPINE COMMISSION.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the Philippines and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the annual report of the Philippine Commission for the year ended June 30, 1910.

WM. H. TAFT.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by W. J. Browning, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House still further insists upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 28406) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912; agrees to still further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. Burke of South Dakota, Mr. Campbell, and Mr. Stephens of Texas managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the fol-

lowing bills:

S. 9903. An act to authorize the Sheridan Railway and Light Co. to construct and operate railway, telegraph, telephone, electric power, and trolley lines through the Fort Mackenzie Military Reservation, and for other purposes; and

S. 9904. An act granting certain rights of way on the Fort D. A. Russell Military Reservation, at Cheyenne, Wyo., for rail-

road and county road purposes.

SHERIDAN RAILWAY & LIGHT CO.

Mr. WARREN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 9903) to authorize the Sheridan Railway & Light Co. to construct and operate railway, telegraph, telephone, electric power, and trolley lines through the Fort Mackenzie Military Reservation, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same.

F. E. WARREN,
M. G. BULKELEY,
JAS. P. TALIAFERRO,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

J. A. T. HULL, F. C. STEVENS, JAMES HAY,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

FORT D. A. RUSSELL MILITARY RESERVATION.

Mr. WARREN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 9904) granting certain rights of way on the Fort D. A. Russell Military Reservation at Cheyenne, Wyo., for railroad and county road purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment.

F. E. Warren,
M. G. Bulkeley,
Jas. P. Tallaferro,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

J. A. T. Hull,
F. C. Stevens,
James Hay,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

ATLANTIC COAST LINE RAILBOAD CO.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Order of Business 1126, being the bill (S. 10397) for the relief of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill named by him. Is there objection?

Mr. BURKETT. I object to the consideration of any bills by

Mr. BURKETT. I object to the consideration of any bills by unanimous consent, unless we can go to the calendar and consider the bills there in regular order.

sider the bills there in regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska objects.

SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS.

Mr. LORIMER. Mr. President, last Wednesday when I made some remarks to the Senate, in referring to the organization of the forty-sixth general assembly I made reference to a member of that body, Francis Brady, and I also referred to the use of patronage in organizing that body. Yesterday the Sena-

THE WHITE House, February 28, 1911.

tor from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] read into the RECORD statements attempting to refute some of the statements that I made. I have a telegram, which I send to the Secretary's desk, from the speaker of the forty-sixth general assembly, and I ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., February 27, 1911.

Hon. WILLIAM LORIMER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Representative Francis P. Brady came to my office and pledged his vote for me for speaker voluntarily in November, 1908. Later he returned and said it was against Gov. Deneen's wishes and he could not be for me, that it would lose him his State patronage and he withdrew his pledge of support.

EDWARD D. SHURTLEFF.

Mr. LORIMER. Mr. President, I also present a telegram from Representative Brownback, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Sr. Louis, Mo., February 27, 1911.

Hon. William Lorimer,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Report that Gov. Deneen made no effort to organize the forty-sixth general assembly is absolutely untrue. He urged me to join his forces and insisted that he would defeat Shurtleff for speaker even if it was necessary to use all of the patronage of his office. J. W. Ford, president of Ford Manufacturing Co., was present at this interview.

D. D. Brownback.

Mr. LORIMER. I submit a further telegram.
The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read the third telegram.

The Secretary read as follows:

Sr. Louis, Mo., February 27, 1911.

HOD. WILLIAM LORIMER.

Hon. WILLIAM LORIMER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

I was present when Gov. Deneen told Representative Brownback that he was doing everything within his power to defeat Shurtleff for speaker for the Forty-sixth General Assembly of Illinois and that he was certain that he would win the fight. Deneen promised Representative Brownback in my presence, among other things, that he would make me a commissioner of southern Illinois penitentiary in case he aided him to Churtleff's defeat a commissioner of s in Shurtleff's defeat,

J. W. FORD, Jr.

HOT SPRINGS (ARK.) RESERVATION.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of two bills. One supplements the other. They relate to the Hot Springs in Arkansas and are matters necessary to the due administration of affairs there. It will require but a moment or two to consider both of them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none.

The bill (H. R. 32082) limiting the privileges of the Government free bathhouse on the public reservation at Hot Springs, Ark., to persons who are without and unable to obtain the means to pay for baths was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The bill (H. R. 31806) to amend section 1 of the act approved March 2, 1907, being an act to amend an act entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon United States commissioners over offenses committed on a portion of the permanent Hot Springs Mountain Reservation, Ark.," was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GREELEY-ARIZONA IRRIGRATION CO.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM. I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (S. 10808) to authorize the Greeley-Arizona Irrigation Co. to build a dam across the Colorado River at or near Head Gate

Rock, near Parker, in Yuma County, Ariz.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands with amendments, on page 1, after the word "dam," in line 5, to strike out the words "twelve feet high," and on page 2, line 3, after the word "within," to strike out "five" and insert "four," so as to read:

That the Greeley-Arizona Irrigation Co., a corporation organized under the laws of Arizona, is hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a diversion dam in and across the Colorado River at a place known as Head Gate Rock, near Parker, Yuma County, in the Territory of Arizona, in accordance with the provisions of the act approved June 23, 1910, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters,' approved June 21, 1906: "Provided, That the actual construction of said dam shall be begun within two years and completed within four years from the date of the passage of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

G. A. EMBRY.

Mr. BRADLEY. I desire to call up and ask immediate consideration of the bill (S. 5037) for the relief of G. A. Embry.

Mr. STONE. I gave notice that after the reading of the Journal this morning I would proceed to address the Senate on the resolution relating to the right of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LORIMER] to occupy his seat. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Owen] gave notice that he would proceed at 2 o'clock. I have been depending upon the chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections to see to it that two hours, at least, were not taken up with other matters.

I now give notice on my own account, which is rather a delicate and embarrassing thing for me or for any other Senator or gentleman to do, that after this bill has been disposed of I shall object to the consideration of any other bill. I wish to say that I do so solely because I do not wish to trespass further than is necessary upon the Senator from Oklahoma.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request

of the Senator from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to pay to G. A. Embry, of Estill County, Ky., \$200 in full compensation for services rendered the United States during the war with Spain.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time,

and passed.

SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS.

Mr. BURROWS. I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan asks that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate. Secretary will state it.

The Secretary. A resolution (S. Res. 315) relative to the election of William Lorimer as Senator from the State of Illinois.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, because of an illness from which I suffered during December and the early part of January my vitality was somewhat impaired, and as I have not yet re-covered from the exhausting experiences of last night I do not know whether I will be strong enough to complete what I have to say or not. Nevertheless I will do the best I can.

Mr. President, before I take up the matter immediately before the Senate I desire to advert briefly to two other matters not connected with the Lorimer case. The first of these relates to something which occurred here last night. During the proceedings last night, when the chair was occupied by a distinguished Senator, not by the Vice President, the Senator from Texas [Mr. Bailey] rose, simultaneously with other Senators, and asked recognition of the Chair, which was given him. He then demanded that when the vote should be taken on the pending resolution-that is, the Lorimer resolution-it should be taken by yeas and nays.

Immediately I rose to my feet. Two other Senators—the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Owen] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Crawford]—also rose immediately, and all of us addressed the Chair with such vigor and volume of voice as we could command. The Chair would not recognize us, but proceeded arbitrarily to submit the question to the Senate, whether the yeas and nays should be ordered.

After that I raised the question of order that the Chair had no right under the rules and the parliamentary practice obtaining in this body to persist in submitting that question to the Senate when Senators were clamoring for recognition. The Chair overruled the point of order, and from that ruling I appealed. The Chair submitted it to the Senate, and the Senate by a decisive vote sustained the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. President, I do not intend to discuss the question involved at length. I well know that there are other Senators so much better versed in the rules of the Senate and the procedure which has characterized this body for years, and with parliamentary law in general, that I prefer to leave a full discussion of the question involved to them on some suitable future occasion, and I have assurance that that will be done when such an occasion presents itself.

I wish now merely to register my protest against the accuracy of the ruling I challenged. I know it has one or two precedents made in the recent past to support it, precedents established very much in the same way as this one. Mr. President, I desire to say that if that ruling is to stand as the permanent judgment of the Senate, then we have now already practically established cloture. We have now a rule of parliamentary procedure against which many of the greatest Senators who have ever served in this body have resolutely and consistently stood, and it never found a place in the laws govern-

ing the Senate until within a very recent date.

Mr. President, if an alert occupant of the chair, instinct with the spirit of usurption, refuses to see, hear, or recognize a Senator when he rises to address the Chair, as I did last night, and persists in ignoring his calls for recognition, and goes on in spite of protests to submit the demand for the yeas and nays, and to count the hands uplifted in support of the demand, and to declare that the year and nays have been orderedif that is to be the permanent policy and rule of the Senate, then we have reached a point when substantial cloture exists in this body. With the occupant of the chair in sympathy with and having knowledge of the purpose of the Senator whom he recognizes, it can easily be arranged for the recognition of the favored Senator, submit his demand to the Senate in spite of clamorous protests, and declare that the yeas and nays have been ordered. If that is to be the rule of conduct, then we have progressed or receded, as you may regard it, in the parliamentary procedure of the Senate of the United States.

With an alert and willing occupant of the chair, aided by a well-coached clerk sitting just in his front, he can, with the slightest lull in the proceedings, start the roll call, and thus

end the debate by sharp practice.

Mr. President, I have heard Senators on this floor within a week, as well as on former occasions, protest in eloquent terms against the Sutherland amendment to the resolution providing for the direct election of Senators, saying it opened a way to the enactment of a force bill and to other statutory evils that might afflict any State or section of the country, and at this time and in the immediate future, the Southern States especially.

Mr. President, I devoutly hope no such legislative crime as a force bill will be presented to the Congress of the United States in future. I hardly believe one will be, and yet it is within the scope of the possible, may I not even say the probable, that many extremely objectionable measures of one kind or another may be forced through the Senate without deliberate consideration and full debate and by the arbitrary denial of

a Senator's parliamentary rights.

I think this is a question that Senators on both sides of this Chamber should deeply reflect upon. If this precedent is a bad one, it should be set aside. It is highly important that it be looked into, that it may be determined whether it so reflects the final, thoughtful, and deliberate judgment of the Senate that it should stand. I can not believe that the great Senator from Maine [Mr. Hale], who has served with such distinction and great influence in this body for a generation, believes in the correctness of this ruiing, and I am confident no Senator on this side would consent to such a change in the parliamentary practice of the Senate as this ruling would bring about. Saying this much, Mr. President, I will dismiss the subject,

at least for the present. I may recur to it on some other and

more opportune occasion.

There is one other subject not connected with the Lorimer case to which I desire to advert. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCumber] moved this morning—and I think very properly—to expunge certain parts of a letter inserted a few days since in the RECORD at the instance and on the request of his colleague [Mr. Gronna]. At the time the letter was read the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN] intimated an objection to having a letter phrased as that was being incorporated in the RECORD, but he did not press the objection. Shortly afterwards, because of the personally offensive nature of the letter, I made a direct objection to its insertion in the Congressional Record, but the Chair ruled that as the Senate had given consent to the reading of the paper an objection would not prevent its being read; but he said he would submit it to the Senate, which he did, and the Senate, by a vote, authorized the whole letter to be read and inserted in the RECORD. This letter may have made special reference to others, I do not recall, but the gentleman to whom the paper particularly referred was Mr. James J. Hill, the official head of the Great Northern Railway. I do not know why Mr. Hill addressed this letter to me, but he did. I think it appropriate in the circumstances that this communication from Mr. Hill should also be inserted in the RECORD. The letter is as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., February 25, 1911.

Hon. WILLIAM J. STONE, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The newspapers contain an account of Senator Gronna, of South Dakota, having procured the reading in the Senate of a letter in which was stated a number of assumed prices of wheat in Winnipeg, Chicago, etc., and that Great Northern stock went from

129 to 136 on the day after the reciprocity agreement was passed by the House. The attached memorandum, which I have prepared, conclusively disposes of both statements.

I also inclose a copy of an article written by a North Dakota farmer entitled "The tariff brought home," which I think you will find interesting the statements.

teresting.
Yours, very truly, JAS. J. HILL

The matter referred to in Mr. Hill's communication is as follows; and to this I invite the considerate, if not prayerful, attention of the Senate, and especially of the Senators from North

MR. HILL'S MEMORANDUM.

According to the news reports, Senator Gronna, of North Dakota, procured the reading in the United States Senate of a letter in which it was stated that wheat prices are now higher in Winnipeg than in Chicago, although they were formerly lower, and that Great Northern stock went from 129 to 136 on the day after the reciprocity agreement was passed by the House. The Senator makes himself as directly responsible for these statements, if they are correctly reported, as if he had uttered them himself. Senator McCumber, of North Dakota, is also said to have stated that American wheat prices have been for many years from 13 to 17 cents higher on the American than on the Canadian side of the line. Both Senators are fighting reciprocity on the ground that it will injure the American farmer. They both show a fine disregard of facts, which the country is coming to expect from opponents of the treaty. Since their attacks is inspired by public statements made by me, the facts should be stated.

I have taken the closing prices of May wheat as officially reported for each day of the months of November, 1910, January, 1911, and the first 16 days of February on which the exchanges were open in February of both 1910 and 1911. This covers the period to February 21, 1911. I have averaged these figures to obtain the monthly averages for each of the three great markets—Chicago, Minneapolis, and Winnipeg. The results are not opinions, but facts. The following are the figures:

	Chicago.	Minneapolis.	Winnipeg.
November, 1910	96	105.4	95
	99.6	106.5	98.6
	111.5	111.7	106.1
	93.7	100	95.6

[From North Dakota Farmer.] THE TARIFF BROUGHT HOME.

THE TARIFF BROUGHT HOME.

The Civic Club at the university considers as its peculiar province the work of studying and gathering information on public questions. During the past year many matters of considerable interest have been considered, but none are of greater significance than the topic that was treated at last Friday's meeting.

"North Dakota and the Tariff." was the topic which was treated by George Shafer, who is one of the most active members of the club and one of the heavyweights. He has given a great deal of study to the matter, as he was a member of the debating team which represented the university in this year's contest against Hamline University, at which time this question was the bone of contention. George is a real North Dakota product himself, a resident of McKenzle County, and an alumnus of the Williston High School. He is a close and careful student of North Dakota people and North Dakota conditions. In discussing the effect of the tariff in our State he said in part as follows:

Of all the questions before the public mind at the present time none has aroused more interest and none more widespread discussion than that of the tariff. For the first time in many years people in every part of the country are seriously asking themselves the question, Do the benefits derived from the tariff compensate for its injury to the country? North Dakota, like most of the other States, has always indorsed a high tariff, but it, like many of the others, has begun to doubt the wisdom of its action. It is with the purpose of showing the effect of the tariff on North Dakota that this task is undertaken.

There is only one way in which a protective tariff can be of any benefit to a State or nation. That is, by keeping out or obstructing foreign competition and establishing what is known as a home market. So, in order to determine whether the tariff helps North Dakota, it is necessary to determine what North Dakota produces and to investigate the condition of the markets in which those products are sold.

NORTH DAKGTA AN AGRICULTURAL STATE.

North Dakota is primarily an agricultural State, and 73 per cent of its people are engaged in one form or another of that industry. The two chief branches of that industry are the production of grains and the raising of stock. For many years vast hordes of cattle were raised and fattened on its western plains, and the Red River Valley has long since attained the reputation of being called the "Bread basket of the world." At the present time there are nearly 2,000,000 head of live stock in the State, valued at \$77,000,000. In 1907 about \$3,000,000 worth of cattle, horses, sheep, and hogs were sold outside of the State. There are 10,500,000 acres of land under cultivation, and still the great plains of the western portion are but scarcely touched. In the production of grains North Dakota is progressing with leaps and bounds. The amount of wheat produced in 1908 was 58,428,000 bushels, while that produced in 1900 was 13,176,213 bushels. (Statistical Abstract of United States, 1908, p. 132.) Nearly the same ratio of increase prevails in the production of oats, flax, barley, etc. It should be remembered also that North Dakota produces more than one-half of all the flax used in this country. Hence, it will be seen from these facts, that not only has North Dakota been a great agricultural State in the past, but that it is destined to remain so for generations to come.

TARIFF DOES NOT AFFECT PRICE OF NORTH DAKOTA PRODUCTS.

but that it is destined to remain so for generations to come.

TARIFF DOES NOT AFFECT PRICE OF NORTH DAKOTA PRODUCTS.

Now the question arises, Does our protective tariff in any way increase the prices of either grains or stock to the people of this State? I do not hesitate to say that it does not now, and has not in the past, added one cent to the market price of either product. The reasons are obvious. The United States is the greatest agricultural nation on earth, and its products find their way into the ports of every civilized country. At the present time, and long before North Dakota came into existence as a State, the United States was annually exporting a large surplus of grain and stock. And the prices of both grain and stock are not determined in the local markets, but in the markets of the world. Liverpool is the barometer of the world's market. There the prices rise and fall, according to the supply and demand, and every rise and fall is reflected in the markets of every country. The difference between the price of wheat at home and abroad practically equals the cost of transportation from here to Liverpool, and no more. All other fluctuations are due to conditions in the home market. So long as we export wheat the tariff can not affect the price. It is, therefore, difficult to see how a duty of 25 cents per bushel on wheat helps the farmer of North Dakota, when the price of his product is determined in Europe.

That the tariff will not prevent the price of wheat from going down so long as we are exporting a surplus is evidenced by past experience. Under the Dingley law, for instance, we had the same duty on wheat that we have now, yet everyone knows that prices ranged all the way from 60 cents to \$1.25 per bushel during the 13 years that law was in force. Also under the Wilson bill, the much-heralded free-trade measure, there was a duty of 25 cents per bushel on wheat, yet the prices must utterly disregard historical experience. It is very plain that in no case has the tariff on wheat is the cause

demand.

Let us now notice a few facts concerning our export and import trade in breadstuffs. The following table is taken from the Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1908, pages 400 and 433:

Breadstuffs exported in year ending June 30, 1908.

Barleybushels_	4, 349, 078
Bread and biscuitpounds	13, 052, 074
Buckwheatbushels	
Corndo	52, 445, 800
Corn mealbarrels_	
Oatsbushels_	
Oatmealpounds	24, 484, 199
Ryebushels_	
Rye flourbarrels_	4, 105
Wheat flourbushels Wheat flourbarrels	100, 371, 057
Total value	\$215, 260, 588
Total value	

The above figures represent the largest surpluses of breadstuffs exported since 1903.

Breadstuffs imported in the year ending June 30, 1908.

and the state of t	,
Barley	
Corn	do 20, 312
Oats	do 364, 307
Oatmeal	do 344, 003
Rye	do 17
Wheat	do 341, 617
Wheat flour	barrels 39, 593
Total value	\$7 138 914

A comparison of these figures will give some idea of the difference in the amounts of our exports and imports. The amount of wheat that we import, for instance, is insignificant as compared with what we export. And that little amount comes from Canada, and after being made into flour becomes a part of our exports.

The situation concerning stock is about the same as that of bread-stuffs. For generations the United States has been a great exporter of cattle, horses, sheep, and hogs, and North Dakota has always furnished its share of the supply, particularly of cattle and horses. Western North Dakota was for years considered one of the greatest stock-raising regions in America, and although the form of the industry is changing, still great numbers are forthcoming. The tariff on stock, as on grains, is of no value whatever. There is a duty of \$30 per head on horses, and the American horse is found in every continent. There is a duty of \$14 per head on cattle, and American beef is eaten by the people of every nation in Europe. There is a tariff on pork, and the American hog has routed his way through the swamps of every country on the globe. In fact, sheep is the only animal that has failed to withstand foreign competition, and most of them have long since left North Dakota, there being only one or two herds in the western part of the State.

State.

The following statistics will throw some light on our export and import trade in stock. (Statistical Abstract of United States, 1908, pp. 398, 433.)

Animals exported and imported in year ending June 30, 1908:

	Exported.	Imported.
Horses	19,000 349,210 3,818	5,484 92,356

Total value exports__ Total value imports__ \$34, 101, 284 4, 777, 454

That the tariff has in no way enhanced the prices of horses, beef, or pork to the producer is self-evident from these facts. This, however, does not mean that the tariff has not raised the price of beef and pork to the consumer, as will be shown later.

TARIFF ON MINOR PRODUCTS.

Besides the duties on grain and stock, several other minor products of North Dakota, such as eggs, potatoes, etc., are also well protected. As we neither export nor import potatoes, it is impossible for the tariff to in any way affect their price. And the only time it ever could affect them would be in the event of an emergency when there is a shortage in the crop. Then the people would be given the privilege of paying 25 cents per bushel more for imported potatoes than what they would otherwise have to pay. There is a duty of 5 cents per dozen on eggs, and in the year ending June 30, 1908, the United States exported 7,590,977 dozen, while our imports were less than one-fourth of a million dozen. Unless American hens go on a strike there is no danger of the tariff ever affecting the price of eggs.

AMERICAN PRODUCTS CHEAPEST IN WORLD.

of the tariff ever affecting the price of eggs.

AMERICAN PRODUCTS CHEAPEST IN WORLD.

But it may be assumed that the tariff upon these various agricultural products has made up for an unfavorable cost of production at home and abroad. That, however, is not true. Notwithstanding the fact that farm labor in the United States is the highest in the world, yet, because of the great fertility from soil, the energy and enterprise of our people, and the use of modern labor-saving machines, the American farmer can produce more cheaply and undersell the farmers of every nation on the globe. The fact that American products are daily selling in Liverpool, in competition with the products produced by the pauper labor of Europe, China, and India. is prima facie evidence of the truth of that statement. But there is other authority sustaining that proposition. Hon. Jacob H. Gallinger, Senator from New Hampshire, in an address in the United States Senate, said: "As regards power of production, Mulhall has shown that a farm hand in the United States does as much as 2 in the United Kingdom, 3 in Germany, 5 in Austria, and 7 in Russia. The farm laborers of Europe do nine times the work to get double the result of the farm laborers of the United States. That is, it takes 4½ Europeans to equal 1 American. Extend the comparison to Asia and Africa, and we find that the average producer in the United States is equal to 10 the world over, outside of our own country. (Citation: "The Tariff and the Trusts," by Franklin Pierce, p. 230.)

Thus we find, not only that the products of North Dakota have been sold in direct competition with those of the other countries of the world, not only that we are now and always have been producing cheaper than any country in either hemisphere, but we search in vain to discover wherein up to the present time the farmers of this State have realized one dollar by reason of the existence of a protective tariff. If North Dakota has been benefited by the tariff it must be in other realms than that of agricultu

TARIFF BENEFITS NO INDUSTRY IN NORTH DAKOTA.

Continuing our investigation, then, let us find if possible what people or industry of North Dakota has been benefited by the tariff. In taking a general survey of the State we notice that the tariff has established no factories, built no mills, stimulated the operation of no mines, fostered no "infant industries," and raised no man's wages. We must conclude, then, that up to the present time the tariff has lent no assistance to the development and prosperity of North Dakota.

CHIEF ARGUMENT GIVEN FOR TARIFF.

CHIEF ARGUMENT GIVEN FOR TARIFF.

However, the chief argument that has been given in justification of protective duties on agricultural products is not that they in any way enhance the prices now, but that they will protect the farmer from the dangers of foreign competition in the future. Attention is called to the fact that the population of the United States is increasing at a greater ratio than our grain supply, and that in a few years this country will be importing cereals in large quantities. It is also pointed out that Canada, our neighbor to the north, is rapidly coming forward as a wheat-producing country; that by the time our country ceases to export wheat, our markets will be flooded with the wheat from Canada; and the high tariff is the only thing that can save the price of wheat from becoming ruinously low, and the consequent destruction of the wheat-raising industry in North Dakota.

UNITED STATES WILL NOT BECOME IMPORTING NATION.

UNITED STATES WILL NOT BECOME IMPORTING NATION.

At the first glance it would seem that the situation was indeed serious, but upon more mature reflection we find that there is really no cause for alarm. Of course it is true that we are not exporting such a large surplus of wheat as in former years, and that Canada is destined to become a great wheat-producing country, but at the same time there is no likelihood of our becoming an importer of wheat for a number of years to come. Senator P. J. MCCUMBER, in an address in Grand Forks on November 12, 1909, admitted that it would be from five to eight years (Grand Forks Herald, Nov. 13, 1909). But that seems to fall far short of the mark. It utterly overlooks the fact that the wheat crop in

this country is also increasing at a rapid rate. In 1890 the total wheat crop in the United States was 399,262,000 bushels, in 1900 it was 522,-229,504 bushels, and in 1908 it was 664,602,000 bushels. (Statistical Abstract of United States, 1908, p. 126.) An increase, you will observe, of more than 264,000,000 bushels, or 66 per cent in 18 years.

Let us look at the question from another standpoint. Senator McCumber says that it takes 64 bushels of wheat per year to supply each person in the United States. Assuming our present population to be 90,000,000, we have increased 14,000,000 in 10 years, and at a rate of one and four-tenths millions per year. It therefore takes an increase of nine and one-tenth million bushels of wheat per year to supply the increase in the population. Now, in 1900 our total wheat production was 522,000,000 bushels, speaking in round numbers, while that in 1908 was 664,000,000 bushels, an increase of 142,000,000 bushels in 8 years, and an average increase of seventeen and three-quarter million bushels per year—almost twice as much as is necessary to supply the increase in population. Let me also call your attention to the fact that the average yearly increase in wheat product for the decade of 1890–1900 was but twelve and three-tenths million bushels, more than 5,000,000 bushels per year less than that of the following 8 years. Assuming that our annual wheat crop remains the same as that produced in 1908, and that our population increases at a rate of one and a half millions each year, it will be 10 years before our surplus will be consumed. In view of these facts it would seem that the statement that our surplus will be extinguished in 5 years is but a forceful creation of the imagination.

WHEAT-GROWING LAND NOT YET EXHAUSTED.

our surplus will be extinguished in 5 years is but a forceful creation of the imagination.

WHEAT-GROWING LAND NOT YET EXHAUSTED.

The further fact is overlooked that not as yet have we put under the plow all of the wheat-producing land in this country, but that western North Dakota and eastern Montana, comprising that vast stretch of territory known in the days gone by as the "Great plains of the West," where for years innumerable heads of cattie, horses, and sheep were wont to roam, is but scarcely touched by the hand of the grain grower. In the year of 1908 only 3,703,000 bushels of wheat was grown in Montana. When this great region is finally put under cultivation there is no reason whatever why it should not be as prolific in the production of grain as it was in the production of stock.

That as a nation we shall not soon be importing wheat is evidenced by the further fact that our export surplus has not been decreasing steadily in the last 5 years. In the year ending June 30, 1908, we exported 100,371,057 bushels of wheat, which was the largest surplus exported since 1903. In fact, there has been a steady increase in our exports of wheat since 1905, in which year we exported only 4,394,402 bushels. (Statistical Abstract of United States, 1908, p. 433.) It would be exceedingly hard to say just when the United States will cease to be an exporter of wheat, but from these facts it is safe to predict that such a time is still far distant, at least, or 25 years hence. When that time does come, however, and the farmers are able to maintain the high duties on wheat, then there is no denying that they will be able to take advantage of the necessities of the people and compel them to pay high prices for the breadstuffs. The best that can be said on this point is that there is no hope of the farmer of North Dakota getting any benefit from the tariff in he immediate future, and it is only in the event that he is able to maintain it for a number of years to come will be ever receive any benefit from our protective tar

TARIFF A BURDEN

Does it injure them; and if so, in what way and how much?

TARIFF A BURDEN.

At the outset it should be borne in mind that protection, like any other institution, is in a certain sense a burden—that is, it costs something to maintain it. There is a tariff on nearly everything we consume as well as on everything we produce. Our people are at the same time consumers as well as producers. So that in order to maintain the tariff upon the articles which they produce they must pay for that protection by bearing the burden of the duties upon the products which they buy and consume. We have seen that since our Nation yearly exports a large surplus of farm products, and that since the agricultural industry is not controlled by a trust or monopoly, that the tariff has no effect upon the prices. That, however, is not true with respect to that enormous number of manufactured articles which our people are daily consuming. The reason for that is very clear. If we purchase an imported article we must necessarily pay the amount of the tariff more than that we would otherwise have to pay for it. If we buy an article made or controlled by a monopoly, we pay an added price, equal approximately to the tariff, for the tariff is one of the things which makes it possible for the trust to impose high prices. For instance, if the normal price of a given article is \$25 and the tariff rate is 50 per cent, then the home monopoly may, by virtue of that 50 per cent protection, raise the price to \$35, and until the price is raised beyond that mark tariff competition can have no effect upon the same. On the other hand, if there was no tariff on that article foreign competition would prevent the price from going beyond \$25. So since the average increase in the Payne-Aldrich tariff law is 50-52 per cent, the average increase in the prices of trust-made goods, due to the tariff, is in all probability in the neighborhood of 50 per cent.

COMPETITION IS STIFLED.

COMPETITION IS STIFLED

In this connection it should be remembered that there is but little competition in this country in the production of the most of the necessaries of life, excepting, of course, agricultural products. And even many of those, such as meat, for instance, is controlled in the home markets. Mr. Franklin Pierce, of the New York bar, in his remarkable book, "The Tariff and the Trusts," says that there are more than 400 trusts in this country covering the production and marketing of most of the manufactured articles. Mr. Lee Francis Tybaryer, of Philadelphia, in his recent book, "The Tariff," makes the startling statement

that more than one-third of all the property in this country is in the hands of monopolies. This last statement is, no doubt, somewhat exaggerated, but at the same time there is no denying the fact that industry is very highly organized, and that a few large corporations are in absolute control of the output of many of our factories, and that these trusts are dictating to the people of this country the prices they must pay.

are in absolute control of the output of many of our factories, and that these trusts are dictating to the people of this country the prices they must pay.

Under the old régime it was not denied that the tariff increased the cost of commodities to the consumers, but competition in the home market was relied upon to prevent the prices from becoming exorbitant. To-day, however, since most of the competition is stifled and the great monopolies reign supreme, the people must patiently bear the added burden. It is obvious, then, that while the people of North Dakota are free from the advantages of the tariff, they are not free from its disadvantages; that its burdens are many and great; and that its injuries are felt every time either an imported or American-made article is sold within the boundaries of the State. The ordinary citizen feels the burden of the tariff when he buys the clothes for himself and family, the carpet on the floor, the furniture in the house, the cooking utensils in the kitchen, the sugar he puts in his food, the tea and coffee he drinks, the musical instruments, if he has any, the watches and clocks which keep his time, the brooms, the glassware, the firearms, the lumber out of which his house is built, the nails used in the house, and the many other things which he must have in order to live in a civilized community. If the consumer happens to be a farmer, he pays liberally for his protection when he buys his mowers, roller, disks, harrows, plows, binders, thrashing machines, wagons, seeders, cultivators, tools, wire, harness, buggles, and the thousand other things which he must sall in a market where the tariff can have no rising effect upon their prices. Of course, all these articles are not trust made or controlled, but most of them are, and those that are not soon will be.

NORTH DAKOTA AT MERCY OF TRUSTS.

Some people are of the opinion that since ours is an agricultural State, and that since not trusts are organized under our laws, North Dakota

Some people are of the opinion that since ours is an agricultural State, and that since no trusts are organized under our laws, North Dakota is not dependent upon the trusts. Campaign orators often flatter the farmer by telling him he is the most independent man on earth; that he feeds all the people in the country; and that the Nation bows humbly at his feet. However charming that may sound to the ear, it is not true. No man is more dependent upon the manufacturer than is the farmer, and no State is more at the mercy of the monopolies than is North Dakota. Our State is one of the richest markets for trust-made goods in the world. Its broad fields are "ripe unto the harvests" all the time. And the monopolies are reaping their enormous profits from those fields "by night and by day." It is true that no trust is organized within our boundaries, but nevertheless our people are daily purchasing the products of each of the 400 trusts in this Union, and have been doing so since the time North Dakota was ushered into statehood.

Authorities do not agree as to the amounts the people of this country are yearly compelled to contribute to the trusts by virtue of the tariff. It is admitted, however, that the sums are enormous. It is also impossible to determine how much North Dakota contributes to these monopolies, but it is safe to say that it bears its proportionate part of the burden. Perhaps the surest method of determining how much the trusts impose upon the people by virtue of the tariff is to notice the difference between the selling prices of certain articles in this country and in Europe which are produced at home and sold abroad. It has long been known that many American manufacturers were selling their goods cheaper in Europe than at home. The report of the industrial commissioner of the United States (vol. XIX, p. 26) says: "In about 20 per cent of the cases covered by the commission returns the exported prices ruled lower than those charged to the home customers." It would be well to remember that this report was given 10 years ago when the famous "American invasion of the world" was but well under way. The exact amounts, however, of those discriminations will give a better idea of the effect the tariff has upon prices in the home market. The following is a list of prices at home and abroad of certain American-made goods, showing the per cent of the unfavorable differences. This list was prepared by Mr. Byron W. Holt, former editor of Moody's Magazine, and was published in 1896 by the committee on tariff reform of the Reform Club in New York City. His statistics are mainly taken from the Manufacturers' Expert and Home-Price Catalogues: PEOPLE DISCRIMINATED AGAINST.

Articles and description.	Export price.	Home price.	Differ- ence.
	7		Per ct
Plows, disk, No. 1each_	\$32,50	\$40.00	25
Harrows, 25-toothdo	18,25	22,00	
Cultivators, wheel, No. 61do	4.00	5,00	
Plows, shovel, No. 20do	2.15	2.50	16
Hoes potato No. 1do	4.75	5.50	-
Wheelbarrows, wood, boltper dozen-	14.50	16.00	11
Wheelbarrows mortardo	18.00	20,00	
Wheelbarrows, stonedo	17.50	19.00	
Wheelbarrows, stonedo Wheelbarrows, garden, wood-wheeleach	2,50	3.00	20
Harrows, wood-frame, 18-toothdo	7.50	9.00	
Board scrapers, No. 1dodo	4.00	8.00	25
Board scrapers, No. 1 do do Horseshoes per 100 pounds	3.38	3.90	15
Callys toedo	3.00	3.90	30
Calks, toe do do Thrashers, horse and steam power, 32-inch each	300.00	400,00	337
Straw stackers, 18-footdo	25.00	30.00	20
Grain weigher and baggerdo	45.00	60.00	337
Clover hullers, 32-inchdo	338,00	480.00	001
Horsepowers, 10-horsedo	143.00	190.00	
Sawmills, 24-footdo	224,00	325.00	
Engines, traction, 8-horsepowerdo	917.00	1,225.00	33
Engines, farm, 8-horsepowerdo	563.00	750.00	600
Clothes wringers, 10 by 13per dozen	18.70	22.50	20
Scales, wagon and hay, 8-toneach	57.00	75.00	11
Scales, depot, 4-tondo	162.00	180.00	**
Incubators, No. 1do	15.00	20,00	337
Potato planters, plaindo	45.00	50.00	111
Potato diggersdo	90.00	100.00	44
Beds, brass, 13-inch pillarsdo	22,67	27.50	5
Beds, crib, 1-inch pillarsdo	20.00	22.50	111
Kitchen knivesper dozen	12.00	16.00	337
Anger bits do	1.60	2.40	48
Auger bitsdo	4.80	8.30	20

These facts and figures give some idea of the discriminations to which the American consumers are subjected at the hands of those manufacturers to whom they have given protection and prosperity. It should be remembered in this connection that our home manufacturers are selling at reduced prices stated above, after paying all the costs of transportation, and in many cases after paying the duties imposed by the foreign countries.

The farmers of North Dakota are consumers of every article contained in the list just given, and it is in this way, by paying these enormous differences to the home manufacturers, that they help maintain the tariff, and at the same time assist in creating those large fortunes that have become so large in recent years that their shadows reach round the world. It is in this way that North Dakota pays for that system of protection which does not protect, and maintains that barrier against a danger which does not exist. If we grant for the sake of argument that the duty on grains will enhance the price a few cents per bushel, still the difference which the people would realize would not pay the interest on the money which they annually pay out in order to maintain the system. But since the tariff falls to enhance the prices of the products of North Dakota both the principal and interest are lost—gone never to return. It is that much capital invested in a scheme which bears no profits; that much energy wasted; that much of a burden to obstruct and retard the progress and prosperity of the State. North Dakota gets all of the disadvantages of the tariff, but none of its advantages; bears all the burden, but receives none of its benefits; receives all of its injuries, but enjoys none of its fruits; gets all the harm, but none of its good; pays the price, but gets no return.

TARIFF ONE CAUSE OF HIGH LIVING.

TARIFF ONE CAUSE OF HIGH LIVING.

But that is not all. Although at the present time the cost of living is exceedingly high, nevertheless as each day goes by it continues to ascend. Indeed, so high and so rapidly have the prices of the necessaries of life risen that not long ago Congress appointed a special committee to examine into its causes. Of course, the tariff is not the only cause for high prices. There are many causes, but there is no denying that it is one of the causes, and some would say the chief cause. There is, however, no dodging the fact that certain industries are absolutely controlled by a few private monopolies, that by virtue of the tariff they are able to impose high prices upon their commodities, and in that way extort illegitimate profits from the public. And as time goes on industry will become more thoroughly organized, corporations will become larger and stronger, the control of the home markets by the large combinations will become more complete, the tariff will be a more deadly weapon than ever before and will be used with greater effect in taking advantage of the necessities of the people.

North Dakota is now, and always has been, a prosperous and progressive State. Its people are energetic, enterprising, thrifty, and progressive State. Its people are energetic, enterprising, thrifty, and progressive. But it has prospered and progressed not because of the tariff, but in spite of it. Its broad prairles have given homes to thousands of people from every State in the Union; its virgin fields have given forth large returns; and in the fresh vigor of its youth it has marched forward, hardly noticing the mill stone around its neck. But some time in the future, when the population becomes more congested and the soil more exhausted, then North Dakota will discover that cause which helped her least and injured her most—the tariff.

LORIMER CASE.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I come now to the case before the Senate. I do not expect to be able to say anything new or throw any new light on the discussion of the facts of this Necessarily I must travel for the most part along the same line pursued by those who have preceded me. I have not thought it was necessary to consume any great amount of time in the discussion of this case. It seems to me that an hour or two would be ample for any one to draw out the salient facts in the case and discuss them as far as is necessary.

I shall not consume much time to-day, only just enough to state in concise form the principal grounds upon which I base my judgment. For some time I have had a fairly welldefined view as to the merits of this case, but hitherto I have refrained from giving expression to that view, because I desired to hear the case fully discussed before taking a final stand. I was all the more inclined to this course for the reason that illness and impaired strength, added to the press of various other duties, had made it almost impossible for me to examine the case with that thoroughness I would have liked and which it deserved. While I had devoted considerable time to the investigation of the more important phases of the case. I had not been able to examine all its details with that critical care which would warrant me in feeling that I was entirely familiar with all its features. I had looked through the testimony taken by the committee and had examined the briefs filed by attorneys, but I wanted to hear what learned Senators, who had made a more thorough and exhaustive investigation than I, might have to say on the one side and the other before I reached a final determination. I was anxious to form as intelligent an opinion as I am capable of respecting the merits of the case and to arrive at a conclusion upon which I could rely with sufficient confidence to justify me in acting upon it. My mind is now made up, and, as the case must be voted upon within a week if it is to be concluded at this session, I shall give voice to some of the reasons upon which my judgment is predicated.

Mr. President, I desire at the outset to say that I have arrived at my conclusion reluctantly and with regret. I regret, first, that I am compelled to disagree with the report of the committee. The majority of the committee who signed this report are among the ablest, most distinguished, and honorable Members of this body. I recognize their great abilities and

have complete faith, as all their colleagues in the Senate have, in their absolute sincerity and in their high devotion to public The one thing above all others that shakes my confidence in the correctness of my judgment is the fact that the Senators who made this committee report express the unhesisenators who made this committee report express the different tating opinion that Mr. Lorimer is entitled to retain his seat. Nevertheless, I feel reluctantly compelled by the force of my own judgment to put myself in opposition to their view. I re-gret, also, that I must take this position because of the personal regard I have entertained for the Senator from Illinois and because of his ability to perform useful public services It is exceedingly disagreeable that I feel obliged to take a position antagonistic to him in the grave emergency which he now confronts, but my conviction is so pronounced that no other alternative seems open to me.

Mr. President, before adverting to the testimony delivered under oath by witnesses, I desire to make some observations respecting party organization and the question of political morality involved in party loyalty.

I can not believe, as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Bourne]

believes, that we are upon the verge, the very dawn of the millennium. The shining gateway to that most happy land does not open to my shorter vision. I am going to refer to the political morality of these gentlemen for the reason that when I come to consider this case the initial fact which challenges my attention relates to Mr. Lorimer's personal part in the senatorial fight at Springfield. Mr. Hopkins had been duly and fairly nominated by the Republican voters of Illinois at a State primary for reelection to the seat he then held in the Senate of the United States.

He had been nominated over several opponents after an arduous contest, and the result had been generally acquiesced in. The Senator from Texas [Mr. Bailey], in the course of his very powerful address defending Mr. LORIMER'S right to a seat, remarked, I think facetiously more than seriously, that if any-thing would justify Republicans bolting that nomination it was the fact that Hopkins was the nominee. Most of us know Mr. Hopkins personally, and I think it not improper to say that he is a gentleman of rather acrid temperament and with very dogmatic and aggressive characteristics. It may be that he was not overly popular among his former colleagues here, and that few of them would have been willing to play Jonathan to his David; and it may be that if it is true, as I suspect it is, that he is personally disliked by many people in Illinois, even of his own party. It is almost inevitable that a man of his irascible and somewhat vindictive disposition would have personal enemies. Why, sir, even gentlemen happily endowed with such patient, serene, and amiable dispositions as the junior Senator from Texas and myself have been known to have enemies in their States. Nevertheless, this may be said for Mr. Hopkins, that he is a man of good character and good abilities. He is also a sturdy Republican, a believer in the doctrines of his party, and one of its consistent and stalwart fighters. Having been duly and fairly nominated at an authorized primary election, concerning the regularity-of which there was no question, he was entitled by every rule of fair politics to the support of every Republican member of the Illinois Legislature when that body came to elect a Senator. I am myself a consistent party man and believe in maintaining and standing by my party organization. I believe the struggle for party su-premacy and for the enforcement of party policies in public administration is necessary to keep alive a keen interest among the people at large in public affairs, and I believe that parties are essential in an important sense to the preservation of our institutions. Therefore I believe in party organization and the maintenance of party discipline. Whenever we abandon this idea we open wide the door to party disintegration. Whenever there are several aspirants for the same position, if a political party hopes to win it must adopt some method for concentrating upon and selecting its party candidate. Necessarily this must be done by a primary election, a party convention, or a Whenever a candidate is so selected I hold it to party caucus. be the duty of every honorable adherent of that party and every advocate of its policies to accept the result, even though he may suffer a disappointment. No man can ordinarily bolt his party nomination without violating principles of good faith and political morality.

If parties are to be maintained, the voice of the majority must rule. Unless it is known that the candidate is guilty of conduct that makes him unworthy of public confidence, and that would make his occupancy of the office to which he aspires a menace to the public welfare, no party man is justified in refusing to obey the voice of the majority and support the candidate. Whenever I see a band of men conspiring to defeat a personally creditable nominee of their party, I at once become suspicious

of something discreditable and sinister in their motives. Only some extraordinary reason will justify a bolt. A bolter is not only a disorganizer, but he is often a public enemy. And right here, Mr. President, I will take occasion to impress this thought by directing attention to some current examples. The States of New York and Montana have Democratic legislatures. A few months ago the people of those States renounced the Republican Party and by decisive majorities declared in favor of Democratic principles and policies. They did not mean to make a mere empty declaration when they cast their ballots. They meant to have a change in the Federal administration, and that the principles and policies represented by the Democratic Party should be applied, or at least have greater weight, in the practical administration of the Government. That was the verdict and the mandate of the people. But that verdict can not be made effective except through the agency of Democratic Senators and Representatives in Congress. When the people of those States elected Democrats to their legislatures they instructed them to elect Democrats to the Senate of the United States. Over in New York the Democrats of the legislature met in caucus, and a majority of the whole number of senators and representatives elected as Democrats voted in legislative caucus to nominate Mr. Sheehan, and he was nominated; and yet we have the pitiful spectacle of a minority, a comparatively small minority, standing out against their party associates and tying up the legislature for weeks and weeks by their unwarranted recalcitrancy. In Montana we have a spectacle even worse than that, if possible. A majority of the Democrats in the legislature of that State have voted and are still voting for Mr. Walsh, but a minority hold out against the majority and even refuse to go into a caucus to decide upon the party nominee. An almost similar situation exists in Colorado. this go on until these legislatures adjourn without electing Senators? If so, then they pursue a course that not only tends to party disorganization, through the creation of embittered factions, but the bolters will be responsible for denying to their respective constituencies the right they won at the polls to be represented in the Senate by Democrats, and that, too, at a time when the presence of Democratic Senators from those States is tremendously important. What right have these men to permit their ambitions or dislikes to imperil so much and so many things of commanding importance? In a political sense, I look upon bolting as being little short of criminal, and I have no patience with men who are guilty of it-at least, no patience with Democrats who are guilty of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will excuse the Chair for one moment. The hour of 1.50 p. m. having arrived and the unfinished business being already before the Senate, the Chair does not think it necessary to again lay it before the

Senate.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, WILLIAM LORIMER is a Republican. He has been repeatedly honored by the people of his He was not a candidate before the primaries for Sena-He did not cross swords with Hopkins and ask the voters of his party to choose between them. Instead of doing that he went to Springfield after the legislature assembled, and there organized a bolt among Republican Senators and Representatives against the election of Mr. Hopkins. I say he organized the bolt. If he did not, who did? Can there be a reasonable doubt that his was the master influence and force at work which organized that revolt and directed its operation? LORIMER did not like Hopkins. His business at Springfield, primarily at least, was to defeat the election of Hopkins; and he was there from the beginning of the fight to its ending. He was the general in command, pulling the strings and directing the force he had organized. All others were subordinate to him; they were but his lieutenants. His was the master mind, and his the dominating influence. Did he leave his seat in Congress and go to Springfield, and remain there for months counseling a course violative of party obligation, calculated to develop war ring factions which tended to party disaster, if not to party disintegration, with no other idea than that of merely blocking Hopkins's return to the Senate? I can not but believe, Mr. President, that the real motive for his remarkable and certainly most unusual activities was not one of revenge so much as one that contemplated his personal promotion. I can not but believe that he was influenced far more by vaulting ambition than by any spirit of vindictiveness. If he did have locked up in his heart a secret or ulterior purpose, what was it? There can be but one answer to that question. That purpose must have been his own election to the Senate. The Scriptures teach us to judge a tree by its fruits. So must we judge men by their conduct and by the result of the things they deliberately do. It is said that the election was offered to Gov. Deneen. But if so, he declined to profit by party treachery, or to take honors

at such a price. He put the temptation behind him, and Lori-MER was elected. May not this alleged offer of the Senatorship to Deneen have been a part of the play? Let me quote from the testimony of Beckemeyer, given before the subcommittee:

Q. Was Gov. Deneen discussed as a candidate for United States Senator that the Democrats, or many of them, would vote for ?—A. I don't think that very many of the Democrats at that time would have voted

or Deneen.
Q. He was discussed among some of them, was he not?—A. I think probably he was.

There is other testimony to like effect. Was it known that such proffers would be rejected, or, if accepted, was it known they would not be carried out? In either event LORIMER'S position would be strengthened and his own triumph made surer at the The refusal of others to enter the race would leave him standing out as the one man available and force a situation which would compel his election as the only solution of the problem. Mr. Lorimer walked through a maze of most complicated and confusing manipulation at Springfield, proving himself a master adept in politics, and came out at the end with a senatorial toga. He not only gathered a band of Republican legislators together, but he brought Democrats as well as Republicans into his combination, and together they wrought out his scheme. Shurtleff and Browne were LORIMER's chief lieutenants and reported to him. These three were a trinity in a close and most confidential alliance. LORIMER and Shurtleff occupied the same rooms at the hotel, and there Browne visited them daily and nightly. There were no secrets between them and no reason for secrets, for the very necessities of the situation made the utmost frankness between all of them absolutely When I behold LORIMER leaving his seat in the essential. House of Representatives on his way to Springfield, and when I see him there at Springfield, a quiet, soft-spoken but forceful man, first gathering Republican senators and representatives about him and then seducing Democratic senators and representatives into his camp, and so welding these antagonistic forces as to make a harmonious body subject to his controlling will, I can not but admire the marvelous skill with which he accomplished his purpose. He was elected by bolters, bolters from both parties, and numerically divided almost evenly be-tween them. The Lorimer Republicans bolted Hopkins and the Lorimer Democrats bolted Stringer, the regular nominee of their party. I have heard it said that these Democrats were justified in deserting Stringer, whose election they say was hopeless, and joining with bolting Republicans to defeat Hopkins, because, forsooth, Hopkins was the Republican nominee, and this because such a course, they say, was calculated to create factions and work harm to the Republican organization. It is claimed that that was legitimate political warfare. We are told that Abraham Lincoln advised his partisans to a like course on one occasion, and other instances are cited where legislators representing opposing parties united on a senatorial candidate. But the case of Lincoln and his followers and the case of Lee O'Neill Browne and his followers are not parallel. Lincoln during his candidacy was not a member of the legislature, upon whom the responsibility of legislative action was cast, but was only a candidate for the Senate, just as Stringer was a candidate for the Senate. Mr. Lincoln, realizing the hopelessness of his candidacy, withdrew himself from the contest and advised his followers to vote for Lyman Trumbull, who, for all intents and practical purposes, was a Republican. Lincoln's followers did not desert him or their party; they only followed his advice that they might elect a Senator whose views accorded with Mr. Lincoln's. But in this case Stringer did not withdraw from the contest. He stood his ground, never wavering and never advising or consenting that the men solemnly pledged and instructed to support him should desert even to another Democrat, much less to a Republican.

No, Mr. President, Lee O'Neil Browne can not shelter himself behind Abraham Lincoln's great name and excuse his desertion of Stringer, the Democrat, and his support of LORIMER, the Republican, by appealing to this episode in Lincoln's life as a precedent. But I will not longer stop to discuss the political ethics or morality involved in a desertion like that of which Browne was guilty, even in cases shorn of venality. Since, however, the alleged example of Abraham Lincoln has been cited to justify that course, I will take the liberty of quoting from another great Illinoisan on the same subject. But before making this quotation, and that it may be better understood, let me first say that the integrity of Salmon P. Chase's election to the Senate by the Ohio Legislature chosen in 1848 was at the time a subject of much controversy. Chase was elected by a combination of Democrats and Free Soilers. Among the Democrats Among the Democrats were two men whose seats in the legislature were contested. They were necessary to Chase's election, and his friends in the legislature, as the result of an alleged bargain, voted to admit the two contested Democrats. Charles Sumner was elected to the Senate from Massachusetts in 1851, also by a combination of Democrats and Free Soilers—a combination which subsequently for several reasons was severely criticized throughout the country. On the 3d day of March, 1854, Stephen A. Douglas, the greatest of Illinois Senators, delivered a notable speech in the Senate during the celebrated debate on the Kansas-Nebraska bill. Replying to strictures made by Chase and Sumner on his motives, Senator Douglas said:

Nebraska bill. Replying to strictures made by Chase and Sumner on his motives, Senator Douglas said:

I must be permitted to tell the Senator from Ohio that I did not obtain my seat in this body either by a corrupt bargain or a dishonorable coalition. I must be permitted to remind the Senator from Massachusetts that I did not enter into any combinations or arrangements by which my character, my principles, and my honor were set up at public auction or private sale in order to procure a seat in the Senate of the United States. I did not come into the Senate by any such means.

* * * The Senator from Massachusetts comes up with a very bold front and denies the right of any man to put him on defense for the manner of his election. * * * Everybody knows that he came here by a coalition or combination between political parties holding opposite and hostile opinions. But it is not my purpose to go into the morality of the matters involved in his election. The public know the history of that notorious coalition and have formed its judgment upon it. It will not do for the Senator to say that he was not a party to it, for he thereby betrays a consclousness of the immorality of the transaction without acquitting himself of the responsibilities which justly attach to him. As well might the receiver of stolen goods deny any responsibility for the larceny while luxuriating in the proceeds of the erime as the Senator to avoid the consequences resulting from the mode of his election while he clings to the office. I must be permitted to remind him of what he certainly can never forget, that when he arrived here to take his seat for the first time, so firmly were Senators impressed with the conviction that he had been elected by dishonorable and corrupt means, there were very few who, for a long time, could deem it consistent with personal honor to hold private intercourse with him. So general was that impression that for a long time he was avoided and shunned as a person unworthy of the association of gentlemen. Gradually, howe

Mr. President, I do not care to further discuss the political morality of such combinations, except to say that if I had been a member of the Illinois Legislature I would have been among those Democrats who remained steadfast in loyalty to Mr. Stringer. I would not have deserted my party standard to consort with the enemy as long as my leader stood his ground and my flag was unfurled. The wage of political sin is as deadly as the wages of other sins. If Lee O'Neil Browne had been honest and true, he would not have led his followers into a foul political mess which besmirched their names and scandalized their party.

Mr. President, I admit that the title of a Senator to his seat, whose election is untainted by actual fraud, can not be invalidated merely because his election was brought about by some combination of hostile political forces. Such an election may be the subject of a just criticism, but it will not invalidate the Senator's title to his seat. What I have said, therefore, about Lorimer and Browne and Shurtleff, and about their connection with the earlier phases of this wretched business, has been said that we might have a clearer insight into conditions preceding the election, and into the conduct and probable motives of men. Mr. Lorimer can not be deprived of his seat unless actual corruption is shown; nor even yet deprived, unless it is also further shown that his election was the result of that corruption, or that he had knowledge of it or sanctioned it.

Mr. President, was bribery employed in this senatorial election? That is the first question. Was White bribed? He confessed under oath that he was. He swore to it before grand juries, petit juries, and the Senate subcommittee. Did he tell the truth? Senators contend that he is a miserable liar and unworthy of belief; and undoubtedly, Mr. President, he is a most despicable character. He is both a Judas and a perjurer. He admits that he betrayed his State and party for money, and admits that he betrayed his friend—the man from whom he claims he received his bribe—for money. Unquestionably the unsupported testimony of such a man is not sufficient to convict anyone accused of any crime.

While the testimony of this creature must be received under grave suspicion and weighed with the greatest caution, still he is capable of speaking the truth; and we must not forget that ordinarily it is impossible to expose the crime of bribery except through the testimony of participating scoundrels. White is a reprobate, and therefore the very kind of man to recklessly use his crime for profit through extortion. If he received a bribe and wasted it in riotous living, he is the kind of man who would seek to retrieve financial distress by blackmailing his confederates, or by putting up his criminal information for sale to the highest bidder. Such a thing is not unprecedented. He did seek to blackmail both Browne and Lorimer. Browne gave him money and sought in other ways to serve him. Were Browne's favors bestowed through friendship or through fear? His pa-

tience in dealing with the fellow's exactions was exceedingly great. If White's story is true, then he held Browne at a disadvantage. If White's story is true, then Browne must have feared this wolf when he began to show his teeth. He cozened him with many endearing terms. He called him "dear friend," "dear Charley," "old pal," and by other tender and familiar appellations. Such endearments and favors were calculated to hold the creature in check, if not wholly lost to all sense of decency; but Lorimer was wiser than Browne. He was wise enough to know that one demand of the blackmailer would be followed by another, and that to yield would only result in further and deeper involvement. And so Lorimer survely showed White the door and turned him down with gracious regrets. But White was not content with the pitiful pin money he got of Browne; he was playing for a larger stake. When Lorimer turned an obdurate face toward him, he sought another market for his wares. He sold his story to the Tribune. Naturally White's maneuvers were bruited about, and naturally, if there were guilty men, they would hunt shelter and seek defense against the coming storm.

All this was to be expected, if White told the truth. Neither LORIMER, nor Browne, nor any man whose name is associated with this alleged bribery, did anything that would surprise us, or anything that we would not have expected, if White told the truth. Everything they did when exposure was threatened, and after it came, were the very kind of things to be expected of them, if White told the truth. To be sure, Browne might have showered his endearments and favors on White, knowing him to be morally depraved, and LORIMER might have written White, as he did, blandly congratulating him on his flattering prospects as an author, when he knew from White's letter to him and from all the circumstances that White was trying to blackmail him-all this may have occurred and yet White's story be false and Browne and LORIMER as innocent as the Certain it is that neither should be convicted on White's unsupported testimony. If there were no strongly corroborating facts and circumstances, Lorimer and Browne would stand instantly acquitted. Unfortunately for the men involved, White's story is strongly corroborated, both by positive testimony and by circumstantial facts. Mr. President, White is a knave of the deepest die, but still it must be admitted that he could tell the truth. And here let me ask, What object could White subserve, what advantage gain, by making a false charge of this kind and bolstering it up by perjury? Even bad men do not do serious things without a motive. If he did not himself receive a bribe, and if he knew absolutely nothing that could involve LORIMER, or Browne, or Beckemeyer, or Luke, or Link, or Wilson, or Clark, or Shephard, or any man in the meshes of dishonesty, what possible motive could have prompted him to commit a perjury so gross, and which inevitably would have been so utterly futile?

Would a man even of his caliber and character deliberately brand himself a perjurer and take all the hazards of his crime without a motive? To say so would be to write him down a lunatic and put him in a criminal class all alone and without a counterpart. If he had a motive, it was prompted by cupidity. But if the vice of avarice and the need of money were so great as to make him willing to commit such a crime against innocent and honest men, how could he hope to profit by it? If there had been no bribery, and therefore no creditable or possible proof of the crime, where could he have found a market for his perjury? The Chicago Tribune is LORIMER'S inveterate enemy, but the manager of the Tribune is not a fool; and, however wicked his journal may be, he would not have dared to print an unmitigated lie like that, and thus impeach the official integrity of so many influential men. If Browne, Beckemeyer, and the others had been honest men, with clean records, they would have been fearless. They would have been as free from fear as Representative Groves, who drove the tempter, Douglas Patterson, from his room. They would have spurned the charge and prosecuted White for perjury and the Tribune for criminal libel, besides instituting civil suits for their vindication. No, no, Mr. President, White would have found a poor market for his story if it had been a lie out of the whole cloth. Still, I say, White must be corroborated, or we must hold guiltless every man accused. Let White be dismissed, therefore, and let us examine the supporting testimony.

Was Beckemeyer bribed? Was Link bribed? Was Luke

Was Beckemeyer bribed? Was Link bribed? Was Luke bribed? Luke is dead, but Beckemeyer and Link are alive and were witnesses before the subcommittee. They were not willing witnesses, and the testimony shows that they uncovered their secrets with the greatest reluctance. Indeed, so unwilling were they to acknowledge their part in this foul transaction that they committed perjury by denying under oath before the grand jury that they had received corrupt money

or had any knowledge that corrupt methods had been employed. And yet, in the end, driven by fear, they confessed to the receipt of money for things done by them as members of the legislature. Beckemeyer testified that he met Browne, on the latter's invitation, at St. Louis on June 21, 1909, a little more than two weeks after the adjournment of the legislature, and that Browne gave him \$1,000, saying, "This is Lorimer money, and there will be some more in a few weeks."

Senator Frazier asked the witness if he understood that this \$1,000 was paid to him in consequence of his voting for Lorimer, and he answered, "I could not possibly infer anything else."

Again, Beckemeyer testifies that he met Wilson, Browne's alter ego, in St. Louis on July 15, 1909, and then and there received an additional \$900 from Wilson. Beckemeyer denied this when he first appeared before the Chicago grand jury. He started in to bluff it through, but when he learned he was likely to be indicted for perjury for denying even his presence in St. Louis at the time alleged he became panic-stricken and hurried back to the grand jury to correct his testimony, and thereafter confessed that he met both Browne and Wilson in St. Louis and received money from both. He was driven through base fear engendered by his conscious perjury to confess his crime. Did he tell the truth? If false, why would he tell such a lie? True, Beckemeyer testifies that while he talked with Browne shortly before LORIMER's election about voting for LORIMER, and talked with other members of the legislature for Lorimer, and talked with other members of the legislature about voting for Lorimer, some of whom said, "I am from Missouri, and have to be shown," yet he affirmed he never received an advance offer of money for his vote. It might be possible, strange as it may seem, that he voted for Lorimer without the hope or expectation of reward. He says that two lightly before the descriptions are presented by the description of the says that two nights before the day LORIMER was elected Browne talked with him about voting for Lorimer, and he told Browne he did not think he could do it, as it would ruin him politically at home. It may be that this man deserted his party standard, betrayed his party nominee, and faced an indignant constituency at home without a thought of any consideration for his sacrifice. It may be that although he received "Lorimer money" he did not expect to get it. Whatever Senators may think of that, it can not be denied that Beckemeyer says that he met Browne a few days after the adjournment—mark you, there was no time lost—and that Browne told him that within a week he would see him and give him a package; nor can it be denied that a few days later he actually did meet Browne in St. Louis on Browne's invitation—indeed, that fact is not denied—and Beckemeyer swears that Browne then gave him \$1,000, saying it was Lorimer money. If all Beckemeyer says is true, by what token can we denounce White's story as false?

Michael Link testified that he met Browne on Browne's invitation in Browne's room in the Southern Hotel in St. Louis in the month of June, shortly after the adjournment, and that Browne handed him \$1,000, saying, "Here is a package for you." He also testified that in July following this visit to Browne he went to St. Louis again on Wilson's invitation to meet Wilson; that he did meet Wilson in Wilson's room in the Southern Hotel, and that Wilson handed him \$900, saying, "Here is a On this visit he swears he met Shephard, Clark, Luke, and White at the Southern Hotel. Oh, quite a lot of these carrion birds were gathered there. Link swore before the grand jury that he did not receive any money from Browne or Wilson, and denied that he ever met them in St. Louis. For swearing that he did not meet those men in St. Louis he was indicted for perjury. Like Beckemeyer he broke down under this indictment and the pressure upon him, admitted that he had lied, and not only confessed that he met Browne and Wilson in St. Louis, but also that he received money from both of them. Like Beckemeyer he swore that he did not receive any reward or promise of reward for his vote prior to LORIMER'S election. He says he talked to Lorimer and personally pledged him his support because of LORIMER's attitude on the deep-water project. He says Browne approached him about voting for LORIMER, but he told him he was too late, as he had already

promised LORIMER his vote. Mr. President, I believe I will read a part of Link's testimony at this point. It is quite diverting, and fitly illustrates what a

tangled web men weave when they attempt by ludicrous falsehoods to deceive:

Q. When after the session of the legislature in June did you see Lee O'Neil Browne?—A. Some time in June.
Q. Where did you see Lee O'Neil Browne?—A. At the Southern

Q. Where did you see Lee O'Neil Browne?—A. At the Southern Hotel.
Q. What date?—A. I do not know.
Q. Give the date to the best of your recollection,—A. During the month of June.
Q. How did you happen to go to the Southern Hotel in the city of St. Louis in the month of June to meet Lee O'Neil Browne?—A. By invitation.
Q. From whom?—A. I do not remember.

Q. From whom?—A. I do not remember.

Q. Was it in writing or oral?—A. I do not remember, sir; that is my testimony on the stand here as a witness; I do not remember whether it was oral, or telegraphed, or written. I adhere to that testimony.

Q. But you went?—A. I certainly did.
Q. Did the message say, whether oral or in writing, the place for you to meet him, or did it not?—A. Well, it told me where to meet Mr. Browne.

Q. Where did it tell you to meet Mr. Browne.

Q. But you went?—A. I certainly did.
Q. Did the message say, whether oral or in writing, the place for you to meet him, or did it not?—A. Well, it told me where to meet Mr. Browne.
Q. Where did it tell you to meet Mr. Browne?—A. At the Southern Hotel.
Q. What did it say—anything further, or did it say the purpose of meeting him?—A. No, sir.
Q. What did you conclude the purpose was?—A. I had no idea.
Q. Nothing at all?—A. No, sir.
Q. What Link, was there any surprise—did it surprise you when you received the message?—A. Not to any extent; he was our Democrat leader, and I respected him as such.
Q. You thought you were going down to a banquet, didn't you?—A. No opinion for that kind of a question.
Q. When you arrived at St. Louis in this month of June; what occurred?—A. I went into the Southern Hotel.
Q. When you arrived at St. Louis in this month of June; what occurred?—A. I went into the Southern Hotel.
Q. Where did you go when you got into the Southern Hotel?—A. I asked where Mr. Browne's room was and the clerk there told me, or some gentleman who had charge.
Q. Did you go up?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. Unannounced, or did you send word that you were downstairs?—A. I do not remember that.
Q. What took place when you got into Mr. Lee O'Neil Browne's presence in his room in the Southern Hotel in the month of June?—A. Well, we were glad to see one another.
Q. What else took place?—A. Mr. Browne handed me some money.
Q. What did he say when he handed you the money?—A. He said, "Here is a package for you."
Q. What amount?—A. I do not think he mentioned the amount to my knowledge: I don't remember.
Q. Well, did you look it over?—A. Oh, I did afterwards.
Q. Did you ask him what it was for?—A. No, sir.
Q. Wey, did you look it over?—A. Oh, I alway it was campaign money.
Q. Wou just took it, did you?—A. I thought it was campaign money.
Q. Wou just took it, did you?—A. I thought it was campaign money.
Q. Wou just took it, did you?—A. I honeyth it was an invitation to be at the Southern Hotel.
Q. In response to any invitation to com

I don't know who it was.

Q. You haven't any recollection on the subject?—A. Pernaps it was Wilson.

Q. It made no impression on you at all, sir, did it?—A. Not particularly.

Q. It was not anything unusual, was it?—A. It didn't surprise me

Q. It made no impression on you at all, sir, did it?—A. Not particularly.
Q. It was not anything unusual, was it?—A. It didn't surprise me very much.
Q. Whom did you meet when you got there?—A. Robert Wilson.
Q. Did you meet him at the time appointed in the communication you received inviting you to meet him at St. Louis?—A. I presume it was the time I had the invitation to come down there.
Q. Now, when did you meet Wilson—I understood you to say it was Robert E. Wilson?—A. I rather think that is the word I got—my invitation, or notice, rather.
Q. From Wilson?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. That was what time, if you can tell the committee?—A. In July.
Q. When you met Wilson in St. Louis, where did you meet him?—A. At the Southern Hotel.
Q. Can you give us the date, please?—A. No, sir.
Q. On your visit to see Wilson, whom did you see that belonged to or were members of the Illinois Legislature?—A. Mr. Shephard; Mr. Clark, and Mr. Luke (he is now dead), and White.
Q. Charles A. White?—A. I think his name is Charles, and Wilson, I believe Robert E. Wilson.
Q. Now, where did you meet Wilson in the Southern Hotel?—A. I presume it was his room, but I don't remember the number of the room or what room it was.
Q. It was a room in the Southern Hotel?—A. It was a room in the Southern Hotel.
Q. When you went in the room at the Southern Hotel, or while you were in a room at the Southern Hotel, were there some members of the Illinois Legislature present, whose names you have indicated to this committee?—A. They were not in the room all at one time, I don't think.
Q. Didn't you see all of them there in that room at the same time, or in there while you were in there?—A. I don't remember. I saw them there at the Southern Hotel that day.
Q. Did Wilson hand you anything?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. What?—A. A package.
Q. Did he hand it to you in the presence of the other members of the Illinois Legislature, if any were there?—A. That I don't remember.
Q. Did you see him hand a package to any other member of the Illinois Legislature?—A. No, sir.
Q. Did he

Q. Did he say, "Here is a package?"—A. He said, "Here is a package."

O. Did you ask him about it?—A. No. sir.
Q. Mr. Link, did you count the amount of money?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. How much was it?—A. Nine hundred dollars.
Q. Were you surprised when you got it?—A. No, sir.
Q. Did you consider you were getting campaign money?—A. Well, to

be sure.

Q. You didn't consider you were getting anything clse, did you, sir?—

A. I had a right to consider it that way, if I saw fit, and that is the way I looked at it.

Q. Mr. Link, you didn't discuss the receipt of that \$900, did you?—

A. No, sir.

Q. What campaign did you have, or did you propose to have next after the month of June or July, 1909?—A. I expected to go back to the next legislature.

Q. When was the next legislature to convene or candidates therefor be nominated?—A. 1910.

Q. In what month?—A. In July.

Q. In July or August, was it not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. 1910?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. It didn't strike you as peculiar that Browne or Wilson on two separate occasions were going to contribute to your campaign expenses more than a year prior to your candidacy, did it?—A. I told you I was not surprised.

Q. Mr. Link, when you went before the grand jury the first time, did you tell them the truth or did you lie?—A. I kept saying I didn't remember until Wayman wrapped me around his finger.

Q. Did you testify that you had not been paid \$1,000 by Browne, and that you had not received \$500 from Wilson, or didn't you?—A. At that first interrogation, the question of Robert Wilson was discussed, but not the Browne \$1,000.

Q. All right, then; the one they first interrogated you about when you went before the grand jury as to whether or not you had met Wilson in St. Louis?—A. I denied it.

Q. Was that true, or a falsehood?—A. I guess it was a falsehood; but I didn't remember of meeting him at that time, or didn't know the date.

date.
Q. You stated you did not meet him at all, didn't you?—A. I stated afterwards that I did meet him.
Q. You stated afterwards you did meet him, but that was afterwards; after you had been indicted for perjury?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. Now, Mr. Link, did Mr. Wayman or any of his assistants or any officer at any time ask you to tell anything that was not true; yes, or no, please?—A. They asked me so many questions, that is a pretty hard question.

officer at any time ask you to tell anything that was not true; yes, or no, please?—A. They asked me so many questions, that is a pretty hard question.

Q. Did anyone, at any time, ever ask you to tell a lie?—A. Not in that specific terms.

Q. Or in any other terms?—A. Not in that kind of terms.

Q. Did anyone, at any time, tell you to testify to any fact other than the truth?—A. Well, I had so many conversations with him, it is hard for me to answer just any remark, Senator.

Q. Tell me if anyone connected with the State's attorney's office, the State's attorney, his assistants, officers, employees asked you to lie?—A. They didn't ask me to lie.

Q. Now, after you were indicted for perjury, you were given the alternative of going before the grand jury and telling the truth, were you not, or be prosecuted for perjury?—A. I came before the grand jury to clear myself.

Q. And tell them the truth?—A. To clear myself.

Q. And tell them the truth?—A. To clear myself.

Q. What do I understand by "clearing yourself?"—A. Telling them I had received some money.

Q. Hadn't you received some money?—A. Well, yes.

Q. You didn't tell the truth, did you, until you got the third-degree methods?—A. Yes; I did.

Q. I am asking you—you are the one that knows, not I.—A. Well, I suppose when I denied seeing Wilson when I did meet him.

Q. You denied, first, having any money from him?—A. I said I didn't meet him, and how could I get any money from him?—A. I don't remember.

Q. Didn't you deny getting any money from Browne?—A. That ques—

Q. Didn't you deny getting any money from him?—A. I said I didn't meet him?
Q. Didn't you deny getting any money from him?—A. I don't remember.
Q. Didn't you deny getting any money from Browne?—A. That question was not asked me on the first occasion.
Q. Didn't you say before the grand jury that you didn't get any money from Browne, and didn't you say you got it after the third degree methods?—A. The perjury charges was placed against me for simply saying I didn't meet Wilson.
Q. The perjury charge was correct, was it not?—A. Afterwards it proved it was; yes, sir.
Q. Didn't they give you a chance to go back before the grand jury and make a clean breast of it?—A. To save my life.
Q. Didn't they give you a chance to go back before the grand jury and make a clean breast of it?—A. To save my life.
Q. Didn't they give you a chance to go back before the grand jury?—A. I told them all I knew.
Q. You lied?—A. I don't know about that.
Q. Now, Mr. Link, you did go back before the grand jury?—A. I certainly did; on Saturday morning.
Q. You told the truth, and then they nollied the indictment for perjury against you; didn't they?—A. Yes, sir; after I answered those two questions.
Q. Mr. Wayman asked you to tell the truth, didn't he? Did he or didn't he; what is the answer?—A. That was about the Wilson affair, my subpoena here. I didn't care about that; I was asked to tell the truth whether I had met Bob Wilson.
Q. He asked you to tell the truth?—A. He didn't ask me anything about telling the truth; I admitted that.
Q. When he talked with you; when Mr. Wayman first asked you whether or not you had received any money from Browne, you denied it, didn't you?—A. Yes; of course I did.
Q. When he asked you whether you had received any money from Wilson, you denied it?—A. That was not before the grand jury.
Q. At any time you denied it?—A. To be sure I did.
Q. When he asked you whether you had received any money from wilson, you denied it?—A. That was not before the grand jury.
Q. You had denied it up to that time. Did you protest

Senator Frazier. If it were true that you met Wilson at St. Louis and he paid you \$900, and that you met Browne and he paid you \$1,000, why didn't you tell that when you came up here before the grand jury and before Mr. Wayman? What were you concealing it for?—A. I didn't want to get myself, perhaps, in trouble and my friends in trouble. I didn't know where the money came from. That was the only reason.

Q. Why didn't you tell it if it were a fact that you got it, and that you met those gentlemen? What were you trying to conceal it for? What was there wrong about the transaction?—A. I didn't know anything about what there was about it. And I didn't desire to criminate myself for taking this money. I didn't know where it came from.

Q. If it were a present to you, and a fair and honest transaction for campaign purposes, or a gift or otherwise, why were you trying to conceal it?—A. I had no reason at all for concealing it.

Q. Why didn't you tell it?—A. Pardon me, I will correct that. I was afraid of getting somebody into trouble; I didn't know where this money came from.

Q. Who were you afraid of getting into trouble?—A. Friends of mine or myself.

Q. Who were your friends?—A. I had a great many friends on the Republican side and on the Democratic side in the general assembly.

Q. How would you get your friends into trouble by telling the truth, if this were a perfectly honest and legitimate transaction?—A. I didn't know how it would get them into trouble, only it struck me I might get them into trouble.

Q. You didn't care to admit that some one had given you \$1,000 without any explantion about it?—A. No, sir.

Q. Was there anything said by you or Browne at the time he gave you this money as to why he was giving you this \$1,000?—A. No, sir. I just supposed it was campaign money; but where it came from I didn't ask him.

A sk him.

Q. You supposed it was what?—A. For campaign purposes or something of that kind.

Q. What sort of campaign purposes?—A. Down in Madison County; it costs a good deal to be elected there.

Q. Had Browne ever contributed to your campaign when you were a real candidate?—A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. Had anybody else ever contributed to your campaign when you were a candidate?—A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. You were not a candidate at that time?—A. I certainly was.

Q. You were a candidate for the next time.—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Had you ever asked Browne for any money for your campaign?—A. No, sir.

Q. You had not?—A. No, sir.

Q. You hadn't suggested to him that you needed any money for your campaign?—A. No, sir; I might have told him—I did have several talks with him—that I was going to have a terrible hard pull to get back.

several talks with him—that I was going to have a terrible hard pull to get back.

Q. Did you suggest to him that you were glad to get that money and you would use it in your campaign?—A. I didn't say anything about what I would do with the money.

Q. You didn't say a word about that?—A. No, sir.

Q. As to where it came from or anything about it?—A. No, sir.

Q. You didn't ask him why he gave it to you?—A. No, sir; I didn't ask any questions.

Q. He simply gave you \$1,000 and you counted it and saw it was \$1,000 and put it in your pocket and went away?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. He made no explanations to you and you asked no questions?—A. No, sir.

and put it in your pocket and went away?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. He made no explanations to you and you asked no questions?—A.

No, sir.

Q. You kept it and used for your own benefit?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When you met Wilson in St. Louis, was that in response to a letter?—A. Some kind of a communication.

Q. Now, when he gave you the \$900, did he tell you why he was giving you the \$900?—A. No, sir; and I didn't know where it came from.

Q. Now, when he gave you the \$900, did he tell you why he was giving you the \$900?—A. No, sir; and I didn't know where it came from.

Q. You didn't ask any questions?—A. No, sir.

Q. Didn't it rather strike you as an extraordinary sort of thing that a gentleman would give you \$1,000 with no explanation, and the other \$900 with no sort of an explanation?—A. I didn't know what source or what business contributed a nickel of that money at all; never was in any consultation to know where he got this much or that, and how would I know about it?

Q. Were you surprised when you took the \$900?—A. Not very much. Q. Why weren't you surprised?—A. I was glad to get it.

Q. Did anyone in your life ever give you \$1,000 without asking you any questions or making any explanation?—A. No; I don't know as they did.

Q. Why was not this an extraordinary sort of thing, then?—A. If he saw fit to give me a present for campaign purposes, I was glad to receive it and ask no questions.

Q. You were not surprised that he did?—A. None whatever, sir.

Q. You were not surprised that he did?—A. None whatever, sir.

Q. You had never had anybody give you \$1,000 before in your life or \$900?—A. Not directly.

Q. We want to get at the whole transaction, Mr. Link, and we are trying to get at the truth about it.—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And we would like to know if at any time there was any reason or any cause why these men should have given you \$1,000 and \$900. Did they owe you anything or have any transaction between you or business or anything?—A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. Did any other member of the legislature ever give you \$1,000 or \$900?—A. No, sir.

Q. Or any other man in your history as a politician or statesman in this State, did anybody else ever give you \$1,000 or \$900?—A. No, sir.

Q. Just on these two occasions. You didn't ask any questions?—A. I didn't ask any questions, and there were no answers given to me or no reasons given to me.

Q. Had you had any information, directly or indirectly, as to any gathering up of funds to be distributed am

Q. You had heard rumors of that sort?—A. Yes, sir; but nothing accurately or definitely.
Q. Did Browne, when he handed you the \$1,900, say anything about your voting for Lorimer?—A. No, sir; he did not.
Q. Just tell us exactly what he said, if he said anything?—A. We talked casually about—
Q. (Interrupting.) Tell us exactly what he said.—A. I don't remember; he was going back to the next legislature, and so was I if I could; that was the conversation, so far as I could remember.
Q. When you first went into his room was there anyone in there?—A. Not to my knowledge; I think he was by himself.
Q. When he handed you the package, was it in an envelope or wrapped up in some form?—A. I think it was just in separate bills.
Q. He just handed you out the money?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. Did he count it or did you count it?—A. I counted it.
Q. He handed you a package of bills and you counted it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When he handed you the thousand-dollar package of bills, did he say anything to you?—A. He said, "This is coming to you." Nothing else was said as to the purpose.

Q. He just said, "This is coming to you?"—A. Something of that nature. I don't remember exactly; of course he was not dumb when he handed it to me.

Q. That is what we want to find out.—A. I don't remember the exact conversation, only he said, "This is a present" or "This is coming to you."

Q. Which did he say, "This is coming to you" or "This is a present"?—A. I don't remember; it was something of that kind.
Q. You can't recall that?—A. No, sir.
Q. What did you reply?—A. I says, "All right, Lee." That is all that was said in relation to it.
Q. You counted the \$1,000?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. Did he say it was \$1,000, or did he just hand you the package and say it was coming to you?—A. I don't remember whether he used the word "thousand" or not. Not much was said in the conversation at all.

Q. When you met Wilson and he gave you \$900, will you just state what he said when he handed you the \$900?—A. Something similar to what Browne said, "This is coming to you," or "This is for you, Mike."

what Browne said, "This is coming to you," or "This is for you, Mike."

"This is for you."

Q. Did you sak him what it was given to you for?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you see anyone else in his room during that time?—A. At that specific time I don't recollect, but I mentioned the different gentlemen that I saw there.

Q. Was there anyone else in there at the time he gave you the package of money?—A. I don't remember whether there was or not; I don't think there was, though.

Q. But did you see other gentlemen come in during the——A. (Interrupting.) No conversation was had, I was with Mr. Wilson quite a little while that day.

Q. Did you see these gentlemen—members of the legislature—Mr. Luke——. A. Yes, sir; during the time.

Q. Shephard and Clark?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And Mr. White. Those were all members of the legislature?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. They were in his room during your visit?—A. During the time of my call there some time, but I can't say just exactly.

Q. They were all members of the legislature who had voted for Mr. LORIMER.

Q. Did you see any other members of the legislature there that day?—.

Q. They were all members of the legislature who had voted for Mr. LORIMER, were they not?—A. I think every one of them had voted for Mr. LORIMER.

Q. Did you see any other member of the legislature there that day?—A. Not to my knowledge; no, I did not; I am quite certain.

Q. You saw Shephard, Clark, Luke, and White?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In Wilson's room?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You don't recollect any others?—A. Not now; no, sir; I do not. Senator Burkows. When you got the \$1,000 you say you didn't know what it was for; did you count it?—A. I don't remember whether I counted it there at that time. I did afterwards.

Q. Why did you count it?—A. To know whether there was a—how much money there was in the package.

Q. That was all?—A. Certainly; I wanted to know how much the present was worth. I wanted to know just what it was worth.

Q. You had no other purpose in counting it?—A. No, sir; none whatever.

What part of this testimony should be credited and what discredited each Senator must judge. One thing this testimony does make perfectly plain, and that is that Link met Browne and Wilson in St. Louis and received money from both. He at first denied these facts before the grand jury, but now admits he then swore falsely. He now acknowledges the receipt of the money, but still insists he does not know for what purpose these large sums were given to him. That part of his testimony is wholly improbable and unreasonable. When he says he had no idea for what purpose Browne and Wilson summoned him to St. Louis you know he lies. When he says he received this money from them without the faintest idea for what purpose it was given, and that he accepted it without asking for any explanation and without any explanation what-ever being offered, you know he lies. When he says he thought the two payments were two presents, or possibly two contribu-tions to his campaign for reelection, 15 or 18 months away, you know he lies. That story is too utterly ludicrous for any unprejudiced mind to give to it the slightest credence. It may be asked why he would admit receiving this money and yet deny all knowledge of the purpose or reason for which it was given and deny all knowledge or even suspicion of the source from which it came. I think this performance, asinine as it is, is not difficult to understand. Link knows that bribery is a felony, punishable by imprisonment in the penitentiary, and he knows that bribery is an odious crime and that a public official guilty of it must wear forever upon his brow the brand of infamy. He feared to confess bribery and face the courts or his constituents. He shrank cowering from a confession that he accepted a bribe for official work, and, hard driven, resorted to the silly device of saying he regarded the money as presents from generous friends or as contributions to a far-off campaign. The mental operations of the man are not difficult to comprehend. Mr. President, with Link's story before our eyes, is it difficult to believe the story of White?

Luke is dead. But Luke was one of the traitorous Democrats who voted for LORIMER. He was also one of that delectable company invited to Wilson's pay-day feast at the Southern Hotel. His wife saw, so she testified, the dispatch inviting him to attend, and there is abundant proof that he did attend. She testified that on one occasion after his return home from some

unknown place-that is, some place unknown to her, and he did not disclose where he had been-but on returning he exhibited a large sum of money, she thought \$950. True, she says, this was before he went to St. Louis to meet Wilson, but when he True, she says, this went or where he went she did not know. This sweet-scented Wilson convention at St. Louis was held on the 15th day of July, and Browne's convention was about the middle of June. It is important just here to keep these dates in mind. Browne was in St. Louis in June and Wilson in July. Mrs. Luke stated that it was after Luke's return home following the adjournment on June 4, and between that time and his visit to Wilson in St. Louis on July 15 that her husband went away on some mysterious journey and came back with this large sum of money. Did he go away in June to meet Browne? Can there be any reasonable doubt of that? All these occurrences were within the compass of a few weeks. Naturally, Mrs. Luke, poor woman, would shield the memory of her husband as far as possible. No doubt she sought to tell the truth, and there is no occasion for denying that she did. But did Luke see Browne before he saw Wilson? He went to St. Louis on Wilson's invi-tation to meet Wilson, just as the others did. If Wilson gave White, Beckemeyer, and Link \$900 each on that occasion, can you doubt that he gave Luke the same amount? And if Luke got money from Wilson, can you doubt that he also received money from Browne? If he shared in the spoil Wilson distributed for Browne, can you doubt that he shared in that distributed by Browne himself? Mr. President, the accusing circumstances all point in the same direction. They are overwhelmingly convincing that Luke was one of Browne's band of criminals. Do not these circumstances involving Luke, and the reasonable inferences to be deduced therefrom, tend strongly to corroborate and support the original story of White?

I come now to Senator Holstlaw-or rather to Senators Holstlaw and Broderick. They are so inseparably connected that we can not speak of one without speaking of the other. Driven as the others were by the fear of criminal prosecutions, Holstlaw confessed to the promise of a reward if he voted for LORIMER, and that after he had voted for LORIMER he received \$2,500 at one time, and \$700 at another time. He testifies that on the night preceding LORIMER'S election he had a talk with his colleague, Senator Broderick, in which both expressed the opinion that LORIMER would probably be elected on the following day, and Holstlaw swears that Broderick said this to him, "Well, there is \$2,500 for you," or, "There is \$2,500 for you if you vote for him." Holstlaw understood, as he must inevitably have understood, from Broderick that he would receive \$2,500 if he cast his vote for LORIMER. And Broderick beyond all reasonable doubt intended by what he said to offer Holstlaw this tempting bribe. I say this because a few days after the legislature adjourned Broderick wrote Holstlaw to come to see him in Chicago, and Holstlaw went to Chicago in response to that letter and visited Broderick at his saloon on June 16, 12 days after the dissolution of the legislature. Several weeks after that he went to see Broderick again at the same place. Holstlaw testifies that these were the only two occasions he ever visited Broderick or ever entered his saloon. On his first visit, June 16, Broderick escorted him into his private room and there handed him \$2,500 in cash. On Holstlaw's second visit Broderick gave him \$700 additional. Holstlaw says that he took the money when offered, and says that Broderick remarked as he handed him the \$2,500, "Here is that money." According to Holstlaw's testimony that was the whole conversation—"Here is that money." What Why, that money. No explanation was asked or given as to where the money came from or for what purpose it was paid, and none was necessary. Broderick was not indebted to Holstlaw, they had never had a business transaction, and this was Holstlaw's first visit to Broderick. Holstlaw was asked:

What did he pay you the \$2,500 for?

And he answered:

I supposed he was paying it to me because he had told me that he would give it to me after my having said I was going to vote for LORIMER, and I supposed that he paid it to me for that.

Again, he was asked if Broderick in his letter inviting him to Chicago indicated for what purpose he desired to see him, and Holstlaw answered:

Well, Mr. Broderick told me that he would give me the \$2,500.

True, Holstlaw would have the subcommittee and the Senate believe that his vote was not bought or influenced by any prospect of reward. In this particular his attitude is like that assumed by Link and Beckemeyer, and, no doubt, for the same reasons. But if Holstlaw's testimony as to his conversation with Broderick the night before the senatorial election and as to the subsequent receipt of the money is to be believed, then, notwithstanding his belated profession of virtuous intention, we have a clear case of an offer to bribe and the subsequent

payment of the bribe money. If Holstlaw is to be believed, we have a clear case of bribery, and bribery committed for the direct and confessed purpose of promoting Mr. Lorimer's election. Did Holstlaw tell the truth? In answering that question I will say, first, that there was an utter absence of any motive for Holtslaw to tell a lie. There is an utter absence of any motive for Holtslaw desiring or consenting to do either Lorimer or Broderick so foul a wrong as to falsely swear that Broderick offered and paid him money to vote for Lorimer. And I will say, secondly, that there is one circumstance that seems to put the fact of Holstlaw's receipt of the \$2,500 beyond all reasonable doubt. That fact is that on the very day he received the money, June 16, he deposited it in the State Bank

of Chicago.

Recognizing the damaging force of this circumstance the friends of Senator LORIMER have denied or sought to discredit the statement that Holstlaw made the deposit to which he testified; but, Mr. President, Holstlaw was corroborated in this behalf by the chief clerk of the bank, Jarvis O. Newton, who swore he received the deposit and made out the deposit slip which he gave to Hoistlaw. The testimony Newton gave relating to this deposit was so furiously assailed, and charges so seriously affecting the integrity of the bank officials and the truth of Newton's testimony were made, that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Cummins] procured the original deposit slip attached to an affidavit made by Newton, in which he identified the deposit slip as the one he had made and delivered to Holst-This original deposit slip and the affidavit of Mr. Newton were exhibited to numerous Senators here on the floor, the Senator from Texas [Mr. Balley] among them. That Senator, on comparing the handwriting of the slip with Newton's signature to the affidavit, declared it to be his deliberate opinion that the two did not correspond and that the deposit slip was a forgery. I examined the same papers, and, although I do not claim to be a handwriting expert, I do not hesitate to say, with all due deference to the Senator from Texas, that to me the writing on the two papers is so strikingly similar that I have no doubt that the man who signed the affidavit wrote the slip. I can not at all agree with the Senator from Texas in this particular. Mr. President, why should this bank officer wan-tonly commit a forgery of this kind, and then appear before the Senate committee and commit perjury to bolster up the forgery? To my thinking that is wholly improbable, for there is an utter absence of motive for doing such a monstrous thing, and I was astounded at the bold attacks made by Senators on this unoffending man. If the committee had the least doubt or suspicion that Holstlaw and Newton had sworn falsely as to this deposit they could have summoned the bookkeeper, the cashier, and other officials of the bank, and compelled them to produce their books to show whether this sum had been charged in the cash receipts and credited to the account of Holstlaw on the particular day named by the witness. But the committee had no doubt as to the veracity of Newton's statement. Can it be imagined that the executive officers of a responsible institution like this bank would commit or sanction such perjury or forgery, or would tolerate any false entry on their books?
Why, sir, there could be no possible motive for such an act,

and aside from every other consideration the exposure of such a crime would have destroyed the bank. If the books of the bank show that that deposit was made, then it was made at the time Holstlaw and Newton stated. Moreover, if that deposit appears on the books of the bank then the deposit was actual and not fictitious. You can not believe that the bank would give Holstlaw a credit for \$2,500 without receiving the money or its equivalent. Further still, if Holstlaw deposited that money as he stated, he received it from Broderick as he stated. If not from Broderick, from whom did he get it? Do you suppose he carried this \$2,500 in cash from his home to Chicago that he might deposit it there and make it a basis of some false charge against Broderick? It seems to me that all talk and surmising of this kind are too absolutely absurd to deserve attention. It is true Broderick denies the conversation with Holstlaw on the night preceding LORIMER'S election, and denies that he paid to Holstlaw any money at any time. He did not deny, however, that he had written to Holstlaw to come to Chicago to see him, as Holstlaw had testified he did, although Holstlaw had never visited him before. He would not say whether he had written such a letter as Holstlaw said he received. He declined to deny that, for he could not tell but that Holstlaw might produce the letter. If you will read Broderick's testimony you will observe that he refused on several occasions to answer pointed questions, giving as a reason for his refusal that he could not be compelled to give testimony against himself, or testimony that might be self-incriminating. If Broderick were a truthful and honest man, why the necessity of shelter-

ing himself behind this privilege and claiming this exemption? Mr. President, taking an impartial and unprejudiced view of all the facts and circumstances it is to my mind perfectly plain, almost indisputably so, that Holstlaw testified to the truth about his conversation with Broderick and about receiving the money. If Broderick told Holstlaw the night before LORIMER'S election that he would get \$2,500 if he voted for LORIMER, from whom did Broderick expect that money to come? If Broderick gave \$2,500 to Holstlaw on one occasion and \$700 on another, where did he get the money? Do you suppose, Mr. President and Senators, that this saloonkeeper gave Holstlaw \$3,200 of his own money? In your hearing on Wednesday last Mr. his own money? In your hearing on Wednesday last Mr. Lorimer described Broderick as his bosom friend; still Broderick would not likely pay Holstlaw \$3,200 out of his own pocket without any consideration therefor. He swore he made Holstlaw no promise, and therefore was under no sort of obligation to him. If that be true, do you suppose that he so loved the junior Senator from Illinois and was so elated over his success, that, bubbling over with joy, he delved into his own pocket, fished out \$3,200 of his own money, and made a jollification gift of that large sum to his senatorial colleague? Yes, sir; Holstlaw's story bears all the earmarks of truth, and if it be true, what good reason have we for denouncing White's story as false?

Mr. President, let me recur to the Browne convocation in St. Louis in June, 1909, that I may propound this question to the Senate: Was the money Browne paid to Beckemeyer, Link, and others bribe money? I do not hesitate to say this, that whether this money, or any part of it, was paid for LORIMER votes or not, beyond all peradventure it was corrupt money, used in some corrupt transaction. Browne and Wilson, of course, deny that they paid any money to any man on the occasions stated. But can you, in the known circumstances of this case, give credit to their oaths? For what purpose were these men assembled at the call of Browne and Wilson in St. Louis? If the mission there was a proper and honest one, why was there so much secrecy about it; and, after the fear of exposure came, why did the participants in those meetings go scurrying about seeking to improvise some defense against the threatened danger? Why did Wilson, in May, 1910, after consulting with his stampeded associates, send out letters to them, dated back to the year before—back to June 26, 1909—inviting them to meet him in St. Louis to discuss the question of giving Browne a banquet? Were they trying to hedge? Why was this posthumous story concocted? Manifestly because they saw the necessity of manufacturing some excuse for that St. Louis meeting. Therefore this letter was written and dated back a year so as to lay a plausible foundation for a contemplated lie. Does not that look as if those men were criminals, fleeing from the wrath to come? If these were honest men, and if the St. Louis meeting was for an honest purpose, there was no need of involving it in mystery, and no need to commit perjury by denying that the meeting was held. There was no need for all that unless these meetings in St. Louis were the culminating acts in a monstrous conspiracy against the honor of a great State. If innocent, every man among them would have scorned the base charge White preferred, and, without a moment's waiting, volunteered the whole truth and sought the vindication of their good names before the courts of the country. But the skulking manner characterizing their every movement, their utter insincerity, their repeated deliberate perjury, all combine to prove them a band of scheming rascals instead of a company of honorable gentlemen. Mr. President, how can you escape the conviction that Browne paid out thousands of dollars to these men? Wilson was merely an agent of Browne, and Browne supplied him with the money he distributed. Where did Browne get this money? Do you imagine for a moment—is it within the range of human probability—that Browne paid all these thousands out of his own personal funds? The very suggestion of that is preposterous. Rather might I ask if there can be a doubt that Browne not only received the money he distributed from some vitally interested source, but that he himself took care to feather his own nest in the interim? Is it reasonable to say that Browne would take the hazard of bribing men without himself receiving some personal emolument?

Mr. President, do the circumstances of the case connect Senator Lorimer with this bribery, and are they sufficient to convince us that he must have had knowledge, some well-grounded intimation at least, as to what was in the air? Remember, sir, his close, confidential relationship with Browne. He seduced Browne from his allegiance to Stringer and made him his right arm in the battle he waged for the senatorship. I know Senator Lorimer denies this. In his last speech he would have the Senate believe that Browne was forced by his followers to the

Senator's support. But no man can read this testimony without seeing that Browne was the one chief, potential force above all others among Democrats, and whose ceaseless activities were most continuously exerted to beguile Democratic votes to LORIMER'S standard; and the testimony shows beyond all intelligent dispute that LORIMER depended upon Browne above any and all other Democrats. Their consultations for weeks ran through both days and nights, and their confidences were many and very close. In fact, I would be almost justified in saying that this relation was so close and of such a character that Browne might well be regarded as Lorimer's commissioned agent authorized to employ whatever means he might deem necessary or advisable to bring his followers into line. Under these circumstances does it seem probable that Browne would discuss money considerations with his followers, make promises and afterwards keep them, with utter ignorance on LORIMER'S part as to what was being done? LORIMER was in command, and he was to be the beneficiary of the contest. Can LORIMER'S lieutenants be guilty of these crimes and yet Lorimer himself, the beneficiary, be wholly innocent? The question "Who furnished the money?" like Banquo's ghost, will not down.

Mr. President, I might go on and consume much time discussing other men and other circumstances connected with this transaction-evidence tending to show a wide range of corruption, and tending to corroborate the story White sold to the Chicago Tribune. I might, for example, discuss the significance of Clark's and Shephard's presence in St. Louis, when White, Beckemeyer, and Link were there to receive money from Browne or Wilson. Clark and Shephard went to St. Louis on the same kind of invitation which carried the others there, and it seems impossible that they attended either of those particular meetings on a different mission. They were there in the same room with Link and White-the same room in which Wilson distributed his corruption fund. What were they there for? Wilson took Shephard into the bathroom. What for? Listen to Shephard's answer to that as he gave it under oath to the

subcommittee:

subcommittee:

Q. Why did Bob Wilson take you into the bathroom on the 21st of July?—A. I don't know; he took me in there to ask me a question. I will tell you the question if you want to know what it is. He asked me who the lady was he saw me with in the St. Nicholas Hotel in Springfield.

Q. Neither of you being married, that question was so confidential that you had to be taken by him into the bathroom so that he could ask you privately?—A. I don't know what prompted him to do it; I can't say as to that.

Q. Did he close the door?—A. I can't say as to that.

Q. Will you say he did not close the door?—A. I am not sure whether he did or not. I can't remember.

Q. Were you the least bit surprised that he should take you out of the main room and into the bathroom and close the door or not close the door, whichever it was, just to ask you who the lady was that you, an unmarried man, had with you in Springfield?—A. I was not surprised at all. I did not think of it. When I told him who it was he said, "I thought it was somebody else."

Q. Were you with this young lady in Springfield when Wilson saw you?—A. At the St. Nicholas Hotel, at the dinner table.

Q. There was no secret about it?—A. No, sir.

Q. It was a relative of yours?—A. Yes, sir; she is my sister-in-law.

Q. And you were all in public?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And a great many other people saw you besides Wilson?—A. Yes, sir; I presume they did.

Q. And just to inquire as to who the name of the young lady was—you having been seen with her in public in the St. Nicholas Hotel—he took you into the bathroom?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And day to all the saked?—A. That is the only question he asked me there and the only conversation we had there; yes, sir.

Senators, do you believe that to be a reasonable story? What was there about a member of the legislature dining with a lady in the public dining room of a prominent hotel that made it necessary for Browne to employ such secretive tactics to ascertain her identity? And yet these two men, Shephard and Wilson, had the audacity to swear to that absurdity as a fact. No, no; Wilson did not invite Shephard into his bathroom for any such idle, albeit sentimental, purpose.

Again, listen to what Shephard said about meeting Browne in

St. Louis:

Senator Frazier. What did Mr. Browne want of you when he wrote you to meet him in St. Louis?—A. I don't know, sir. He just simply said in the letter or telegram, whatever it was: "Will be in St. Louis at Southern Hotel" at a certain date, "and if convenient will be glad to see you."

O. When you saw him did he make any explanation of what he wanted or why he had written?—A. No, sir; I suppose it was just a visit, Mr. Browne and I were very good friends during the session, and he knew I went to St. Louis very frequently, as I do—I go down there nearly every week, maybe twice a week.

Q. He made no explanation to you as to why he wanted to see you?—

Q. He made no explanation to you as to use No.
No.
Q. You did not talk politics?—A. We may have talked some politics or in the room. I can't recall what the conversation was there. Q. You did not there in the room.

Mr. President, I submit that that story, under all the facts and circumstances of which we have been advised, is wholly incredulous. But I forbear to further consume the valuable incredulous. time of the Senate by pursuing this phase of the controversy.

Mr. President, that there was talk of bribery and efforts to bribe during the senatorial contest is made evident by the testimony of witnesses, members of the legislature who did not vote for Lorimer, as well as by the testimony of those who did vote for him. I refer to such men as Terrill and Groves. These men stand unimpeached, and no charge of dishonorable conduct can be fairly laid at their door. Perhaps in saying this I ought to except the assault made upon Groves and Terrill by the Senator from Texas [Mr. Balley]. With due respect, and certainly without meaning in the least to offend, I am bound to say that in assailing these men my distinguished and eloquent friend from Texas gave to his zeal and to his imagination too free a What are the facts? Groves was twice called to the stand by the committee. On his first appearance he was reported by the stenographer as saying that Terrill told him that he had received a thousand dollars for voting for LORIMER. That is the way the testimony appeared in the record. Later he was recalled, at his own request, to correct that statement and did correct it. He declared that he did not say on his first appearance that Terrill told him he actually got a thousand dollars for voting for LORIMER, but that Terrill said that he had been told there was a thousand dollars in sight if he would vote for LORIMER. This is all the Senator from Texas quoted, and thereupon he proceeded to speak with exceeding harshness of Groves. But let me read what immediately follows Groves's correction of that part of the record quoted by the Senator, and thus prove that Groves was both fair and honest:

Mr. AUSTRIAN. The witness notified me that he desired to correct that statement.

That is, the statement that Terrill told him that he received \$1,000 for voting for LORIMER. Then this follows:

Senator PAYNTER. Yes; I didn't understand him to say that, anyway. Mr. Austrian. That is the way the record reads. I didn't understand it, either, but that is the way the record reads.

So you will observe, Mr. President, that Groves did not swear that Terrill said he had received money for voting for LORIMER. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAYNTER] agreed with Mr. Groves, that the fault was not with Groves, but with the record. The Senator from Kentucky said, "I did not understand him Surely that ought to settle it. I think to say that, anyway." the Senator from Texas must have overlooked what I have quoted, for I am sure he would not do Mr. Groves an intentional injustice. I am sure he would not have sought to discredit Groves in the way he did if he had had the part of the record I have quoted in mind at the time. Terrill himself said that a member by the name of Griffin, from Cook County, asked him to vote for LORIMER, and, being curious to know what was in the wind, he asked Griffin what there was in it, and Griffin answered, "A thousand dollars, anyway." And right here it is not amiss to call attention to the fact that Griffin was the Democratic member whose vote "Hinky Dink," the celebrated Chicago politician, pledged to Lorimer. Griffin is the man Terrill swears told him that there was \$1,000, anyway, in voting for Lorimer. It seems, Mr. President, that "a thousand dollars" was the standard market price for votes at Springfield at that time for members of the lower house. There is considerable testimony of this kind running through this voluminous record, but I will keep my promise, and forbear to follow it in detail. And so I will leave my discussion of the testimony at this point.

Mr. President, in the face of what Beckemeyer, Holtslaw, and others, whose evidence has been quoted, testified to; in the face of all the damaging and damning facts developed by both positive and circumstantial testimony, and in the face of all that appears in this most accusing record, Senator LORIMER sat silent as the dead. He had no explanation to make; no word to say. Why did not Mr. LORIMER take the witness stand, speak out like a man who had naught to fear, answer any question propounded to him, and tell everything he knew about the case? Does this attitude of silence comport with innocence? If it was shown that Beckemeyer, Holtslaw, and White had received money for their votes, if it was shown that other legislators had also been the recipients of corrupt money, and if it was shown that still others had been approached with corrupt overtures, did not this volume of inculpating testimony shift the burden of proof on Mr. LORIMER and make it imperative that he should defend his title?

I ask again, if Browne paid this money to Holstlaw, Beckemeyer, and the others in the way they alleged, is it within the scope of things probable that Browne alone was guilty of offending against law and public decency, and that Lorimer wended his tortuous way through the maze, always the dominating and directing influence, without a stain? I will not contend, for it is unnecessary, that Browne was LORIMER's agent in the sense that LORIMER was bound by all his acts. It is unnecessary to

apply the legal maxim qui facit per alium facit per se-he who acts through another acts himself. I do not invoke the rule which governs the relation between principal and agent. It is sufficient for the purposes of this case that we try it by the testimony, unswerved by sentiment and unmoved by passion. It is sufficient if the facts brought home to the Senate convince you that want of knowledge on the part of Mr. Lorimer is wholly improbable. We must judge of Mr. Lorimer's knowledge on probabilities—on probabilities that leave no room for reasonable doubt. I hold that it was incumbent upon him, and if innocent it was a duty he owed to himself, to answer before the If innocent, he should have taken the stand and frankly stated all he knew and submitted himself to the most rigid interrogation, purged his election of taint, and thus defended his title. He made no attempt to defend himself under the sanctity of an oath, but preferred to remain silent while the investigation was in progress and come here to defend himself in a speech before the Senate. He should not have waited to make his defense as an orator or an advocate, pleading his own cause before the forum which is trying him. His address was, indeed, replete with eloquence and pathos, but the Senate is obligated to judge the case solely on facts developed by the testimony delivered under oath. It was meet and proper for him to address the Senate, but that was not the opportune occasion, nor that the most convincing way for him to offer his testimony. Judging this case by the testimony submitted, I am driven, Mr. President, by the irresistible force of my conviction to say that I do not believe Mr. LORIMER is entitled to the seat

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 32216) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of discussing briefly the pending proposition to institute a trade relation between the United States and the Dominion of Canada. I want to say clearly at the outset that I am opposed to this trade relation, this proposed reciprocity agreement. Before I enter upon that theme, however, Mr. President, I am disposed to give way to the temptation to make a slight reference to what the distinguished Senator from Oregon said last night; I think it was last night; so much has engaged the Senate and at such unseemly hours that I would not be sure. You remember Rip Van Winkle was not sure it was last night after his 20 years' sleep.

In all my experience in listening to political addresses I do not believe I ever heard a more doleful story of a man's own country than that which was given by the Senator from Oregon. I am sorry he is not in his seat now. I am told it is not courteous to make reference to a Senator who is not in his seat,

But I have violated many precedents of the Senate and may be permitted to violate another. Just think of it, this lamentation of last night, this foreboding of evil, came from Oregon, which is washed by the waves of the Pacific, which has been termed our new American lake; in Oregon, where the flowers are in bloom and children at play. I felt at the conclusion of the Senator's remarks that if I had been entitled to take any part in the performance arranged for last evening, I should have advised the Senator from Oregon to stop upon any street in Washington where he heard the music of the Salvation Army, in order that he might be where he could hear a rosy-cheeked hallelujah lassie shout "Glory to God." Then he might have taken new courage and might have set his face more hopefully toward the future.

I want to say to the Senators that you are not performing the duties devolving upon you. This is part of my mission. The Senate should proceed to vote on the resolution involving the honor and seat of a Member of this body. The Senate should proceed to vote squarely upon the measure concerning which I have the honor to speak. The Senate should also vote on the proposition to create a tariff commission. The Senate should consider every appropriation bill and close up its business and go home, as the American people have a right to expect the American Senate to do. There is no sort of necessity for a special session of Congress.

Senators discuss the way and manner of electing Senators. It has been said that if we change the manner of electing Senators, we are going to secure better quality. I say to you that what is needed here is more patriotism and less attention to political factions and less ambition for factional leadership. This Senate can not retain the respect of the American people unless higher ground is taken and more consideration given to

Mr. President, when I return to my theme, after this digression for the good of the order, I am reminded that a few days

ago the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. Hale] made complaint in relation to the uncertainty of the predictions offered by the Weather Bureau. I want to suggest to him that, while there may be doubts about the Weather Bureau's predictions, there can be no doubt about the political prediction which I made in this Chamber on December 15 last foretelling the new assaults to be made on the interests of the farmer in any new arrangement of the tariff.

Now it is proposed to arrange a swap with Canada, a sort of trade back and forth.

I am opposed to the adoption of the proposed trade agreement with Canada. I am opposed to it because it is unfair. It is popular because of misapprehension. Reciprocity is used in trade generally to cover up sharp practice or hypocrisy on one side, or on both. Reciprocity is never satisfactory. represents borrowing hoes and plows and kitchenware on the farm. You can not keep books with a neighbor on the plan of borrowing and lending. Borrowing and lending represents an undefined swap with no date fixed for final settlement. Those who have lived on a farm know that a borrowing neighbor is the worst thing that ever happened. If the borrowing represents a clevis or neck yoke, it is found never to have been returned and is missing when most needed. Pardon these familiar agricultural expressions. Some of those who hear will understand. If this borrowing ever happens and you find the articles you wanted are missing, it will be evident that there has been reciprocity in operation; some neighbor has secured the article and never returned it. This reciprocity business is a masquerade. There are millions of people in the United States who will never be satisfied until we have free trade and they never can present it in its own name and right. trade in the past 15 years has tried many aliases. it is time that it traveled in its own name. I read a story once about some young fellows in a frontier town in Texas, where the opportunities for entertainment were few and where there were no amusements, who, after a night of it, felt in the early morning hours that there was little more to be done. One of

cost and could not make anything except that he sold so much.

Sensible neighbors neither borrow nor lend. They prefer to buy and pay for what they get. Thus they preserve friendship and self-respect.

them suggested that as a new means of entertainment, they get together and tell their real names. Now, in this discussion of reciprocity with Canada, we have gone far enough to tell

into the United States will lower prices of the farmer's products, yet that nobody is going to pay anything less to the farmer. Once there was a merchant who said he sold his goods below

We are told that the flow of Canadian grain

our real names.

In reciprocity agreements each side feels that it has played a trick upon the other, and when one side discovers that it has had a majority of tricks played upon its side, notice is immediately given that reciprocity is at an end. The pending reciprocity, so it is stated, is to let Canadian grain in without doing any harm to the American grain producer. It is particularly stated that the proposed agreement is to let wheat in, in order that certain of the American people may have cheaper bread. In the same breath it is stated that this arrangement will do no harm because the price of wheat is, and has been for a century, fixed in Liverpool. By this Canadian arrangement, we presume, the American is to surrender the American market to the Canadian and take the Liverpool market in exchange.

But we are told that the price of wheat is fixed in Liverpool. I was born a Democrat and heard that alleged fact in my early youth. It made the West Democratic, at different times, but finally perished in face of the facts as fiction always perishes in the presence of facts. The Liverpool story is as old as the old Bryan statement about the parity between wheat and silver. If I could speak the dialect of Minnesota I could make this plainer.

The alarming thing is that occasionally an American farmer has been found willing to make this exchange. In this connection it might be well to inquire why the Canadian wants to get into the American market if the price of wheat is fixed in Liverpool.

If the Liverpool market is so good and desirable, why does Canada prefer ours? Have you thought of that? If it is such a glorious thing to ship wheat across the Atlantic, why not let George do it?

Is it possible that the Canadian maket is unsatisfactory? Is it possible that Canada prefers to feed the workmen who are engaged in building automobiles in Detroit, to taking any chance on the workman who buys his grain in Liverpool? The truth is probably to be found in the statement that Canada

has discovered, through observation of more than a century, that a good home market beats any market across the water.

I am opposed to this Canadian trade agreement, because it

seeks to present to Canada a fortune as great as all the Dominion's present possessions. It seeks to present to Canada what she has needed ever since that historic day when Wolfe died

on the Plains of Abraham, to wit, a market.

The Dominion has had resources, but has been in need of a customer. The plan of the United States has been to locate the resources and the customer side by side. The Dominion is larger in area than the United States; yet the United States has 91,000,000 of people, while the Dominion has about 7,000,000 of people. Canada is big enough to be a country on her own account. She should frame up and carry out her own ambitions. She should make her own laws, build her own roads, and put up her own lighthouses. She should establish her own school system, pay her own taxes, and achieve her own results.

When we buy from Canada, we should pay her tariff duties. When Canada buys from us, she should pay our duties. In this way there will be no old book accounts to settle; there will

be no hard feelings, and we shall speak as we pass by.

When a Canadian comes to our markets, driving over our roads and bridges with his grain, he should be required to sa-lute the American flag, and in lieu of the usual salute he should be required to pay a small amount in the way of tax for the privilege of a greater market than he has been able to The American people should be paid something for how to create markets and promote enterprises. The knowing how to create markets and promote enterprises. Canadians should be penalized for not knowing how. No foreigner has any right to come in and do business with us without paying us something in the shape of taxes. I do not care whether a man comes in as a farmer or a manufacturer. A

farmer is just as good as a manufacturer, and, in some cases,
It has been said that letting the Canadian farm products
come into the American market will do no harm to the Americans. The markets of our great products are said to be fixed on the other side of the water. But suppose that when the American arrives in Detroit, Buffalo, Cleveland, Chicago, Milwaukee, or any other great city within easy water transporta-tion of Canada, having with him a load of produce to sell, he is told that the Canadian has already been to town and has supplied everybody and that the American products must be hauled back home or shipped to Europe. Just as a matter of patriotism, I think the American ought to have an opportunity Just as a matter of to get to town first. If anything is shipped abroad, it ought

not to be ours. If there were a river, like the Yellow River of China, flowing down through Canada and on down through the United States, and that river did not begin to spread over all the lowlands and drown all the people until it reached the United States, is there a man who would not say that something ought to be done to check the flow of that stream before it reaches our country? The illustration carries its own moral. The principal objection to this proposed donation to the Dominion of Canada is yet to be mentioned. This so-called reciprocity agreement practically confers American citizenship on the Canadian. And he is not even asked to take off his hat while the oath is administered. If he has been holding a mean view of the Republic, he need not change his mind while coming to our market. If he thinks the average American is a bluffer and pretender, he can continue to think so. If he regards our free institutions as a joke and our public schools as a farce, he can adhere to that opinion. He is not going to contribute anything for building roads or bridges on the American side. He is going to haul his grain over American roads. He is going to drive his cattle or hogs over our highways to our markets and sell to our people, returning to his Canadian home with his American money in He can pass over an American road and in view of an American schoolhouse to which he has not contributed one penny. He can return to his cheaper land and paint his home or leave it unpainted, just as he elects. He can congratulate himself that he did not locate in the great Republic, but that he was reserved for better conditions, where he could have all the advantages of the great Republic with none of its responsibilities. He can congratulate himself that while he is a citizen of what many men consider the greatest kingdom in the world, he can sell his products in the greatest republic in the

After this American donation is made a citizen of Canada ought to feel proud. He will be, in fact, a cosmopolitan citizen. Great Britain is a great nation. We call her the "mother country." In enriching Canada we are enriching Great Britain. In case of war with the mother country, Canada would furnish the largest number of soldiers to fight the Americans,

and the Canadian soldiers would have been matured and fattened in the American market. I am not a jingo, and I never expect a war with Great Britain; I am only suggesting what might happen. Why should we enrich Canada? we not try to cultivate American soil? Why should we not make a renewed effort to ennoble American agriculture for the purpose of keeping American boys and girls on the farm?

If we are going to make Canada practically a commercial member of the American Republic, why should not Canada help to maintain the American Agricultural Department? Or, why should we not board up the American Agricultural Department and send Secretary Wilson back to his Iowa farm? Or, why should we not send him back to the Iowa College of Agriculture, inasmuch as some branches of his education appear to have been neglected?

If we are going to buy our surplus from Canada, why should we be spending millions of dollars in irrigation enterprises and in attempting to reclaim the arid lands of the Far West?

If the proposed donation is made to Canada, the donation masquerading under the name of reciprocity, there will be thousands of good farmers this very year removed from the Mississippi Valley to Canada for the purpose of farming cheaper land. In Canada these farmers will not be compelled to furnish the hired man with a horse and buggy and give him possession of Parlor A in the home. In Canada the hired man may be willing to sleep in the garret, as he did on the American farms until the doctrine of protection made the American farmer a gentleman. In Canada the American farmer can hire the Asiatic and produce wheat, oats, barley, and live stock for the American market, with no duty whatever. In Canada he can grow rich, provided the American market remains open to

But why is this trade arrangement proposed? It is put forward as a means of reducing the cost of living. It is boldly proposed that the farmer shall receive less for what he produces in order that those who do not produce food products may buy their food supplies cheaper. Food is only a small item of

living expense at the present time.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCumber] told us the other day that we spend more for liquor than we do for bread. Not a man here said anything about reducing the supply or the price of liquor. [Laughter.] A Senator from the South the other day asked the Senator from North Dakota if he had the audacity to suggest an increase in the cost of bread. The southern Senator had just been out to see the price of cotton, and come back rejoicing that the price had gone up. What we really want is reciprocity between cotton and corn. Both

classes of farmers should make money.

The unhappy thought in connection with this entire affair is the refusal on the part of the public to consider the rights of the farmer. The farmers are regarded as a necessity, and there are those who feel their products are, like air and water—or ought to be-incidental to human life and without expense. is also singular that the intelligent and civilized world calls a man great who has cornered the wheat market and made millions out of the public, while the same educated and refined civilization feels that the farmer ought to produce it without apparent profit. A speculator is a hero and gets his name in print when he endows colleges or gives large sums to the Young Men's Christian Association, but the producer is of no consequence. The large centers of population have been indorsing the Canadian agreement with the purpose, brazenly stated, to cheapen the products of the American farm. American history has never disclosed such a spectacle. If the American is noted for anything, it is his willingness to pay a "live-and-let-live"

The American people have received with applause every mention of reciprecity. It is applauded, because it is not under-stood. Nearly every man regards reciprocity as a means of cheating the other man. The laboring man regards reciprocity as a means of cutting down the earnings of the farmers, at the same time increasing everybody else's compensation. From this estimate of justice may angels and ministers of grace defend us! Pardon this departure from senatorial language; it may be necessary sometimes, in order to speak the truth.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I should like to interrupt the Senator from Iowa, with his permission.
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Kean in the chair).

the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Oregon? Mr. YOUNG. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, at some time during the debate this morning, about half past 3 or 4 o'clock, I suggested to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Brisrow] that instead of reading the testimony he was reading to the Senate, with

which we are all familiar, he had better read the New Testament, with which many of the Senators, particularly on the Republican side, are not familiar. I would ask the Senator from Iowa to call attention to some of the truths taught in the New Testament.

Mr. YOUNG. Yes; as has been said in all these other debates, "I shall come to that presently." [Laughter.]

But now, those who are not engaged in farming appear to want to fix the farmer's prices. The farmer has passed into the minority as a citizen. There are Members of Congress elected who never see a farmer except when they go through the country in an automobile or the 18-hour limited. Formerly all hats went off to the farmer. Now his toil is unappreciated. He is looked upon complacently. He is mainly thought to live in Kansas and wear whiskers.

If the farmer's prices were submitted to a referendum of all the American people, lower prices would be ordered.

The greasy loafer would come out of his cellar in the large city and would go to the polls and vote to reduce the cost of The same loafer has refused to go to the wheat field on special trains and there to receive \$3 a day and board during the harvest time.

If a man were to go to the city of New York and offer steady employment to 50,000 present-day loafers who want to reduce the cost of living, not a man would leave the city to go out into the sunshine and the open. He probably would fear that he would become a decent man under the elements. Nature baptizes the soul of man who works out under the sky.

This Canadian contract is said to be popular. Boards of trade, commercial organizations, and all kinds of organizations composed of consumers have indorsed it. A great many men have voted for it without stopping to think. Others have not been considerate enough to care.

As a rule, American people sympathize with all strikes and all the aspirations of all classes for greater income.

A few nights ago 5,000 employees of the Government in the District of Columbia held a meeting in Washington to give expression in favor of greater pay. People of Washington generally sympathize with the movement. I do not think that the Government clerks are sufficiently paid. I hope their salaries can be increased. But their salaries should not be increased on account of the high cost of living, provided the free-trade arrangement with Canada reduces the cost of living, according to promise. The salaries should not be increased on account of the high cost of living, provided those who receive the salaries intend to immediately arrange to reduce the cost of living. At the meeting referred to, which was for the purpose of demanding higher wages, I have no doubt a resolution would have been unanimously passed, demanding a reduction of the earnings of the farmer. These are strange contrasts. But there are other contrasts. The American Congress shuts out the Asiatic on account of American citizenship, and then in the next breath proposes to require the farmer to furnish cheaper products while denying him cheaper labor. If the were permitted to overflow this country and were to work with the same industry they do at home, they could produce enough from the American soil to feed one-half the people of the civilized world. But cheap food does not mean happiness in any line. It does not even mean plenty. When the corn laws of England were repealed, the workingman did not receive one additional comfort, and there are more idle men in London at this hour than before the corn laws were abrogated.

Why should the Pacific coast demand such protection at the hands of the Federal Government and receive it and the same protection to no greater extent be denied the American farmer?

The farmers of the South used to complain that cotton was only 5 cents a pound. There was no clamor for cheap cotton. Cheap cotton meant an impoverished people. There was rejoicing when cotton went up to 15 cents per pound. Since that time the South has prospered, banks are overflowing with money, and times are good.

Why should the cotton grower then be willing to join this crusade in the interest of Canada and against the American farmer?

The southern cotton grower should remember reciprocity as between himself and his brother farmer of the North who produces food products.

Yet I heard a Senator on this floor in this debate, a Senator who represents a cotton State, indignantly inquire if it was proposed to keep up the price of bread.

The price of bread bears about the same relation to unground

wheat that the dollar shirt bears to raw cotton.

If Cuba were as large as Canada and produced cotton, there would not be a vote in Congress for the free admission of cot-

ton at the ports of Charleston, New Orleans, Galveston, or Mobile. Is not the grain-producing farmer as well worthy of protection as would be the cotton-producing farmer under the conditions I have named? Should not the northern and southern farmer stand together? It is true that there are cotton mills in the South, and it is true that the mill hands must be fed, but has not the cotton grower more interest in the northern American farmer than he has in the New England manufacturer?

It is a pitiful story, but it is a fact, that a few thousand Massachusetts fishermen, some 30 miles from the center of intelligence in the United States, who object to the Canadian trade contract, have been able to receive more attention as regards their objections than have the farmers of the Mississippi Valley to the number of millions. Yet the fishermen do not grow fish. They do not plant them in the sea. An all-wise Creator put them there. 'The sea feeds millions of the world's poor. The Gloucester fishermen simply go down to the sea in ships. Their fishing vessels and their labor constitute their entire investment.

I now come to the causes leading up to this proposed calamity. The blame should be placed upon the shoulders of men who call themselves insurgents. I notice they have all disappeared from their seats and are probably under the ammunition wagon. [Laughter.] The insurgents, having been defeated in Congress, decided to carry their factional grievances out to the people, not for the sake of the people, but in order to whip another faction and establish new leaderships. They infuriated the people.

Some great newspapers, broken hearted because wood, pulp, and paper were not put on the free list, backed up the insurgents and urged them on. The insurgents made the speeches and the inflammatory arguments, and some of the great news-papers did the rest. The mournful part of it is that these in-surgents were from prairie States, from the States producing The insurgents took the commercial lives of farm products. their constituents into their hands and went forth to battle, as I think, for their personal ends. Now the country proposes to respond to the insurgents by giving the newspapers what they ask for, and by giving the farmers what they did not ask for, and giving the insurgents what they did not expect. But the insurgents are geniuses. They know the game of politics. They are preparing to crawl out from under the proposed trade agreement while the newspapers are preparing to enjoy cheaper printing paper and the farmers are preparing to get it in the The insurgents and the newspapers are guilty, but the

blow will strike the farmer.

The insurgents say that they are opposed to this Canadian reciprocity because it does not go far enough. An Irishman confessed to his priest and said he had been stealing hay. The good father asked him how much. He said, "Your riverence, I might as well confess to the whole stack, as I am going back after the other half to-night." [Laughter.] want another chance at the farmer. The insurgents

Is there no other way to awaken that grand old party of Lincoln except to go through the valley of the shadow of defeat? How gloriously it came out of its last great defeat when it rallied and gave the country the gold standard.

Unfortunately the farmer is not organized to contend against the organizations, political and commercial. He has been told during the past 10 years that the tariff ought to be revised downward. He believed the politician and gave him his votes. Little did he dream that hides were to be put on the free list and that shoes were to remain protected. Little did he contemplate that the same principles were to be carried further and that the manufacturer was to buy in a free-trade market and sell in a protected market. Little did he believe that when real tariff cutting began he would be the first to be attacked. Little did he believe that flour and meat were to be protected, while wheat and live stock were to be put on the free list. But he went to the political meetings, he heard the statesman tell how he was taxed, and he voted for lower duties. Now comes the awakening. He may have faith in the politicians again; but if so, it will be after some reflection.

But men say the Republican party has outlived a protective tariff and can get along without it. I heard a man say that the Christian religion could get along without the Bible, the religion being so well established. Another man pointed to a workman on a ladder. He said: "The workman is up there all right. Why not remove the ladder?" The moral is apparent.

It is difficult to make American people contented with their own market. Without a merchant marine the average American wants to start out looking for the markets of the world. If Germany, France, Italy, or Japan had control of our market, they would look no further. Mr. President, I want to say for

myself that I am opposed utterly and always to this proposed free donation to the Dominion of Canada. It would be a wrong to every American.

Big Tom Reed gave a tariff application to one of Æsop's fables. Tom Reed helped to make Iowa a protection State. The fable related that a lean, lank, hungry dog was swimming across a stream with a juicy beefsteak in his mouth. Seeing the shadow of the meat in the water, several times as big as it was, the dog dropped the meat he had to grab the meat he thought he saw, and lost both. The great speaker also related that there crawled up the bank on the other side the wettest and hungriest dog in all that neighborhood.

I omitted one thing when I referred to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Bourne]. I had hoped that he would be in his seat by this time, but I will meet the requirements of courtesy and read this speech to him some time. He talked about the political boss and about the utter death of political liberty without fixing the exact date. I want to remind him that there is greater political liberty in the United States now than at any time since Columbus landed. There are 57 varieties of Republicans alone [laughter], and the returns are not all in. The Democratic varieties will be discovered when the new Congress convenes. [Laughter.] I am not through with this part of my theme; I can return to it just as readily as others can return to the Lorimer case. [Laughter.]

I want to say to those Republicans of the 57 varieties who are going out of the Senate, and those who may chance to come in, that if you pretend to be Republicans, you have a work to do. Having in mind the lamentations from Oregon, I think the American motto should be that we buy at home and build at home. What will our ambitious young men do, what are their ambitions for if they are not to have employment in our own country?

The farmer's life is one of toil. His prices are none too high. The past 10 years have been his most prosperous ones. The day has been at hand which the protectionists long foretold, and it is cruel, it is brutal, to continue to build hotels 20 stories high with a daily increase of price so far as every product on the table is concerned and to accompany all this with the demand that the raw material shall cost less. The northern farmer who grows food is just as worthy of a good price as the southern farmer who grows cotton. Both are just as worthy as the New England manufacturer. I want no Chinese wall built around America. I want America to trade with every country under the sun, but I want it to be on a cash basis. Reciprocity is free trade in a masquerade. It is the first move toward the destruction of the American style of living and all that we call The entire world would rejoice if the American Republic could be brought down to the world's level of earning and living and of prices. If I were master of the situation, the world would have to wait a long time. I am in favor of eight hours for a day's work. I am in favor of good pay for the men who do the work. I am in favor of gardens around the homes of the working man. I am in favor of the little home having a library and a piano. I am in favor of education and art. I am in favor of improvement, better roads, bigger and better schoolhouses, the church, and the music teacher in the village. I am in favor of more joy in the home and anything that will contribute to that end. I am in favor of loyalty to the American flag and to this great Republic. It is a privilege to live in this great land where liberty is universal and opportunity so inviting. I want every country in the world to prosper. This end can be accomplished by every country cultivating its own patriotism and keeping its own ideals.

The middle man may be robbing the public. The farmer is

The middle man may be robbing the public. The farmer is not doing it. He is working in the open. He is doing his duty, and is entitled to what he earns.

The country owes something to the American farmer. He found the way from the New England beginnings to the pathless West. His ax stroke in the forest awoke the silence of the ages. He built the church on the edge of the clearing. He contended with all the dangers of the frontier. He has given to the country a sturdy race of men. He blazed the trail from Daniel Boone's hunting ground in Kentucky to the valleys of California. He has fought the battles of the Republic from Lexington to Yorktown, from Bull Run to Appomattox. Activity made his sinews, dangers and responsibilities gave him his character and the alertness of his eye. His ear responded to the noise of the breaking twig as quickly as would the ear of the wild beast. His rifle has been above the door. His home has been sacred. It is no flattery to say he has been the bone and sinew of the Republic. He is neither a loafer nor a revolutionist. He is for honor and peace. We owe him more than

forgetfulness when trade contracts are made and men are clamoring that everybody's products except their own shall be reduced in price.

In China the farmer is considered the first of citizens. This should be his standing in the great Republic of the United States.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I would not trespass on the time of the Senate at this juncture, especially in view of the short time remaining of this session and the fact that a large number of very important measures remain to be considered and disposed of if it were not for the vital importance of the Canadian trade agreement to the people of the State which I have the honor, in part, to represent. North Dakota, however, is an agricultural State, and the acceptance of the agreement in its present form, or its rejection, means more to her people than it does to those of any other State in the Union. I should consider myself remiss in my duty did I not attempt to make clear how this agreement will affect my State injuriously. In my discussion of the question I shall endeavor to be as concise as may be consistent with clearness, and as brief as possible.

There are two questions that would naturally call for some consideration in connection with legislation affecting our commercial relations with another country—the one, the question of how the legislation will affect our own industries and our own commerce, and the other, the question of how it will affect our diplomatic relations with the other country and whether it will cause the two peoples to entertain more friendly feelings toward each other or whether it will arouse ill will. This latter question would naturally force itself upon us when considering such legislation directed toward our friend and neighbor on the north, Canada, so alike us in many respects and separated from us only by a political boundary line. larity of language, customs, industries, products, ideals, and habits of thought, and identity of interests have always tended to unite neighboring nations, and it is small wonder that some of us, viewing Canada's undeveloped resources and contemplating her undoubted future, have dreamed of the day when but one flag would wave over all of North America north of the Mexican boundary line. It has been intimated that such considerations weighed heavily with our Representatives who accepted the terms of the proposed trade agreement with Canada, now pending in this body.

If this were so, it might be well to hesitate before condemning this agreement on purely economic grounds and consider whether it were not better to bear for a while industrial and commercial disadvantages in the expectation of reaping gain and glory for our country in the future. It has been authoritatively denied, however, that this agreement was negotiated with any such purpose in view, and I for one shall accept this denial at its full value and decline to be influenced one way or the other by any consideration of whether the ratification of this agreement would be a forerunner of a commercial union between the two countries, to be followed later by a political union. As the amicable relations between the two countries at present leave nothing to be wished, and as a failure to ratify the proposed trade agreement by either country will be no cause for a break in these friendly feelings, we may dismiss the question of the political aspects of this agreement and consider merely its economic and industrial effects.

Certain sentimental reasons have been urged in favor of this agreement, which appear to me to be irrelevant. The fact that the Canadians are our "cousins" does not prevent them from competing with our producers whenever the opportunity offers; nor does it make the loss resulting to the American producer from such competition any less real; nor should the fact that many of our friends and relatives have emigrated to the Canadian northwest and are now residents of Canada influence us in this matter. It is our duty to remember that we are here solely to legislate for the benefit of the citizens of our own country, and that this consideration should be paramount in deciding the fate of this trade agreement.

The one question remaining is whether or not the adoption of this agreement will be beneficial to the people of the United States. If it is found that the agreement will benefit some section, some class, or some industry, the question arises whether this will be at the expense of some other section, class, or industry. These considerations will guide me in the discussion of the pending measure. I shall not debate whether or not it may be expected that the agreement will in time change the political relation of Canada to the United States or raise the question of whether this was considered by the representatives of either party to the agreement.

This agreement has been favored by different men for different reasons. Some have frankly expressed their hope of the annexation of Canada to the United States and the hope that

this agreement will help bring this about. Some men, apt to judge legislation and other matters by the name applied to them, without examining into their real nature and result, favor this agreement as it has been called a reciprocity agreement, and this term presupposes mutual benefits. frankly admit they want free trade, and look on the adoption of this agreement as the first step in this direction, expecting the farmer, when he sees all his products on the free list, to demand that all other products be admitted free of duty. With many of these political considerations also enter in, and there are those who frankly admit that they hope for the ratification of this agreement, as it will tend to disrupt the Republican Party and to increase the dissatisfaction of the farmers with the Republican Party and the present administration, who will receive the blame if this agreement is ratified at this session of Congress.

Then there are those favoring the agreement because they see in its ratification a benefit to the industry in which they are

engaged. They are:

1. The manufacturer. He hopes to extend his market in Canada because of reduced duties on imports into Canada. In some instances his profits on each article manufactured will be increased, as he will be able to import his raw materials from Canada free of duty and at a lower cost than if forced to depend on the United States for raw materials. Some, perhaps, hope in time that the removal of the duties on farm products will lower the cost of living to such an extent that the wages paid their employees may be decreased, or, at any rate, that they may stop increasing.

2. The railroads, who hope for increased business and in-

creased profits carrying the Canadian products, especially the

Canadian grain.

3. Business men and commercial organizations, who hope to extend their business operations with the freer commercial intercourse. In many cases their indorsement of the agreement arises from an imperfect understanding of its real nature.

4. Printing companies and large newspapers, who hope that the matters will in time be so adjusted as to give them free

print paper.

Our former reciprocity treaty with Canada was negotiated in 1854 and was in operation 10 years. It admitted free of duty grains and breadstuffs of all kinds, animals of all kinds, meats, cotton, wool, seeds, vegetables, fruits, fish of all kinds ments, cotton, wool, seeds, vegerables, fruits, had of all kinds and products of fish, poultry, eggs, hides and skins; stone or marble, crude; slate, butter, cheese, tallow, lard, horns, manures, ores of metals of all kinds, coal, pitch, tar, turpentine, ashes; timber and lumber of all kinds, unmanufactured; plants, shrubs, and trees; firewood, pelts, fish oil, rice, broom corn and bark, gypsum, grindstones, dyestuffs; flax, hemp, and tow, unmanufactured; unmanufactured tobacco; rags.

This treaty was abrogated in 1864. During its operation many causes of dissatisfaction arose. While our trade with Canada increased, it appeared that our imports increased more than our exports did, and it was charged that Canada derived all the benefits from the treaty. It was charged that canada derived were admitting free of duty practically all the products of Canada, that country not only did not admit free of duty those articles that we would naturally want to sell in her markets, but was actually engaged in gradually increasing the duties on those articles. Mr. Israel P. Hatch, in a report to Mr. Howell Cobb, Secretary of the Treasury, dated March 28, 1860, makes the following statement:

The treaty was conceived in the theories of free trade and in harmony with the progress and civilization of the age. It was a step forward in political science. American legislation had been characterized by an extraordinary liberality to a foreign neighbor, placing her lines of transportation upon an equality with our own, and her merchants upon an equality with our own, in receiving foreign merchandise in bond. We conceded commercial freedom upon all their products of agriculture, the forest, and the mine, and they have either closed their markets against the chief productions that we could sell to them or exacted a large duty on admission into their markets.

The treaty had become unpopular long before the expiration of its 10-year term, and was abrogated by a joint resolution

approved January 18, 1865.

The trade agreement which is now pending in the Senate places the following articles on the free list: Live animals; poultry, dead or alive; grains; peas and beans; corn, except into Canada for distillation; hay and straw; fresh vegetables; fresh and dried fruits; dairy products; eggs; honey; cottonseed oil; seeds, including flaxseed; fish of all kinds, except when packed in oil; fish oils; salt; mineral waters; timber and lumber, not planed; paving posts, railroad ties, and poles; wooden staves; pickets and palings; gypsum, crude; mica, unmanufactured, and mica, ground; feldspar; asbestos, not further manufactured than ground; fluorspar, crude; glycerin, crude; talc, not for toilet use; sulphate of soda; soda ash; extracts of hemlock

bark; carbon electrodes; brass in bars or rods, and brass in strips, not polished; cream separators, and parts for repair; rolled iron sheets; crucible cast steel wire, value not less than 6 cents per pound; galvanized wire, 9, 12, or 13 gauge; type-casting and typesetting machines and parts; barbed fencing wire; coke; rolled round wire rods, in the coil, of iron or steel, not more than three-eighths of an inch in diameter and not less than No. 6 wire gauge; wood pulp and print paper. fine irony, it is provided that lemons, oranges, limes, grapefruit, shaddocks, pomelos, and pineapples grown in Canada are not to be admitted free of duty to the United States. I am certain I never met anyone who had ever heard of anyone guilty of trying to raise these fruits in Canada.

The agreement also reduces more or less the duties on a number of manufactures. It is apparent at first glance that the products to be admitted free are farm products, raw materials, and the products of fisheries. While the tariff is reduced somewhat on a few manufactures, the old duties are retained in most instances. It will be interesting to note the duties on some of the manufactures, the raw materials of which are on the free list. Live animals of all kinds are to be admitted free, but fresh meats pay a duty of 11 cents per pound; so do dried and smoked meats; canned meats are protected by an ad valorem duty of 20 per cent; fresh pork pays a duty of 1½ cents a pound; so does bacon; extract of meat pays a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem; lard, a duty of 11 cents per pound; tallow, 40 cents per 100 pounds; poultry is free, but canned poultry pays a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem. Wheat is free, and flour is protected by a duty of 50 cents a barrel; rye is free, but rye flour pays a tariff of 50 cents a barrel; oats are free, but oatmeal has to be protected by a duty of 50 cents per 100 pounds; corn is free, and corn meal pays a duty of 12½ cents a hundred; barley is free, and barley malt pays a duty of 45 cents a hundred pounds, and pearled barley pays a duty of ½ cent per pound; buckwheat is free, but on buckwheat flour there is a duty of ½ cent per pound; prepared cereals pay a duty of 171 per cent ad valorem; bran and middlings, a duty of 121 cents per 100 pounds; biscuits and cakes, sweetened, pay a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem. Flaxseed is free, but on linseed oil the old duty of 15 cents a gallon is retained. Fish is free, but when packed in oil it pays a duty of from 2 to 5 cents a package. Timber and unplaned lumber is free, but on planed lumber the duty ranges from 50 cents to \$1.50 per thousand. It might be difficult to convince anyone that it costs \$10 more to slaughter and dress a beef dressing 800 pounds, in the United States than in Canada; that it costs our mills 50 cents more to grind a barrel of wheat than it does the Canadian mills; that it costs 15 cents more to manufacture a gallon of linseed oil, or that it costs from 50 cents to \$1.50 more to plane a thousand feet of lumber in the United States than it does in Canada.

I wish at this point to insert a table, showing the yield and value of crops produced by the United States and Canada in 1909 and 1910, which I ask to have printed as a part of my remarks.

Crops in 1909.

		-po in accer		
	Yield.		Value of crops.	
Crops.	Canada.	United States.	Canada.	United States.
Corn bushels Wheat do Oats do Barley do Buckwheat do Flaxseed do Potatoes do Hay tons	19,258,000 166,744,000 353,466,000 55,398,000 2,715,600 7,806,600 2,213,000 99,087,200 11,877,100	2,772,376,000 737,189,000 1,007,353,900 170,284,000 32,339,000 17,488,000 25,856,000 376,537,000 64,938,000	\$12,760,000 141,320,000 122,300,000 25,434,000 1,254,000 4,554,000 2,761,600 36,309,000 132,287,700	\$1,652,968,000 730,046,000 408,174,000 93,971,000 23,809,000 12,188,000 39,466,000 206,545,000 - 689,345,000
Total			479,159,700	3,856,512,000

Crops in 1910.

	Yield.		Value of crops.	
Crops.	Canada.	United States.	Canada.	United States.
Corn bushels Wheat do do Barley do Hay tons	21,277,000 149,989,000 323,449,000 45,147,000 15,497,000	3,125,713,000 695,443,000 1,126,765,000 162,227,000 60,978,000	\$12,092,000 112,973,000 114,365,000 21,400,300 149,716,000	\$1,523,968,000 621,443,000 384,716,000 93,785,000 747,769,000
Total			410,546,300	3,370,682,000

This comparison does not include all the crops that the United States and Canada produce. For instance, in the 1909 table, I have left out the production of cotton and tobacco for the reason that Canada does not produce these crops, and

similarly I have left out some of the crops that Canada does produce, but for the production of which in the United States I have not been able to obtain any figures. My purpose is not to compare the production of wealth in the two countries in any one year, or several years, but to compare their production of crops which they both produce and in the sale of which they will compete with each other. For the same reason I have omitted the yields and values of rye, buckwheat, flax, and potatoes in the table for 1910, as I had no figures available as to Canada's production of these crops in 1910.

The value of the corn, wheat, oats, barley, rye, buckwheat, flaxseed, potatoes, and hay produced by Canada in 1909 is thus found to be \$479,159,700, and the value of these same crops produced in the United States is \$3,856,512,600. The value of the corn, wheat, oats, barley, and hay produced in Canada in 1910 is found to be \$410,546,000, and the value of these same crops produced in the United States in 1910 is similarly found to be \$3,370,682,000. Omitting the figures as to corn, which Canada does not, and never will, produce in sufficient quantities to entitle her to be considered a competitor in its production, we have the following figures for 1909: The production of Canada, \$466,399,700; the production of the United States, \$2,203,544,000. For 1910 the figures are \$398,454,000 and \$1,846,714,000, respectively. In other words, the production of Canada in 1910 of wheat, oats, barley, and hay is in value equal to almost 22 per cent of the production of the United When we consider that the production of these crops in Canada, especially of wheat and flax at present, is increasing by leaps and bounds, we can not get away from the fact that Canada is and will in the future be a competitor to be reckoned with in the production of agricultural products, and I submit that, assembled here to legislate for the whole people, we can not, if we would do our duty, avoid the consideration of what effect the removal of the duties on all farm products will have on our agriculture, the industry on which the prosperity of this Nation must ultimately rest.

It has been urged that the absorptive capacity of our markets

It has been urged that the absorptive capacity of our markets is so great that the influx of Canadian products will not affect American prices; it has also been argued that the price of most if not all of the products of our farms is set in the world's market and that the removal of the duties on them will have no effect on their prices. So far as the first contention is concerned, I believe that a hasty examination of the figures of production of Canadian crops will convince anyone that Canada produces enough wheat, oats, barley, and other crops to affect the prices of those products when coming into competition with them. With regard to the second contention there might be a difference of opinion. It may be instructive to examine in this connection the production of wheat for the last 10 or 11 years, and also the exports of wheat and wheat flour during the same years. I ask to have printed as a part of my remarks a table showing the production and export of wheat for the years 1900–1910.

Production and exports of wheat by the United States for the years 1900-1910.

1900-1910.		
Calendar years.	Production.	Exports, fiscal year ending June 30 following.
1500	Bushels. 522,229,505 748,469,218 670,063,008 637,821,835 552,399,517 692,979,489 735,269,970 684,687,000 684,687,000 685,443,000	Bushels. 215, 990, 673 224, 772, 515 202, 905, 598 120, 727, 613 44, 112, 910 97, 609, 425 146, 700, 425 163, 043, 669 114, 268, 468 84, 472, 352

The exports of wheat flour have been reduced to bushels, at the rate of $4\frac{1}{2}$ bushels to the barrel.

It is apparent from these figures that while our production of wheat is increasing our yearly exports are decreasing, due to the fact that our consumption of wheat is increasing more rapidly than our production. Following the short wheat crop of 1904, our export of wheat and wheat flour fell to 44,000,000 bushels. The short crop of 1910 will, in all probability, leave a surplus for export, although it will very likely be less than that of any year since 1904.

So long as we continue to export considerable quantities of wheat, the tariff on wheat will not raise the domestic prices above export prices, except in exceptional cases, as, for instance, the formation of a corner in wheat. As many people have found to their sorrow, however, successful corners are few and far between. But when our competitor is as close a

neighbor as Canada the duty on wheat does tend to steady our markets by preventing the Canadian crop from being dumped into them in the fall. The Canadian northwest is a new coun-As in other new countries, men with little capital go there to win a home and wrest their fortune from the soil. In the early years of their settlement money is short; their purchases are made on credit, with the agreement to pay for them as soon as the crop is thrashed. The result is that practically all the bills of the settler in a new region must be met in the fall. As soon as the crop is thrashed, the farmer must hurry his crop to the market in order to meet his obligations, and the great bulk of the crop is marketed within a short time after it has been thrashed. This breaks the market. The exceptionally heavy receipts with no unusual demand depresses the price below its normal level, and the farmer who is forced to sell at this time does not receive the price for his wheat that he should. Agricultural papers and others interested in the marketing of farm produce have for years urged the wheat growers of the United States to "hold their wheat;" not to rush it to market as soon as thrashed, but to sell it gradually. Until late years, even though the farmers have recognized the wisdom of this plan, it has not been followed, for the simple reason that the great majority of the farmers in the wheat-growing sections were not in a position to do so. They were compelled to sell most of their wheat in the fall, and the wheat markets were regularly glutted. Now this is changed; money is more plentiful and the average farmer can hold his wheat if he feels that market conditions are such that he will not realize its full value. With the free admission of Canadian wheat, however, there is danger that we shall again have the rush of wheat into our terminal markets, especially Minneapolis and Duluth, in the fall, with the consequent unsteadiness of the market and the depression of the price of wheat below the point where it should be. This can not fail to affect our wheat growers, even though we may still be exporting large quantities of wheat and wheat flour.

A consideration of the figures as to our production and our consumption of wheat, however, will convince anyone that in time the latter will overtake the former and that we shall consume all the wheat we produce. When that point is reached the tariff on wheat will increase the domestic price of wheat. With the tariff retained on wheat, I do not believe that we shall import any considerable quantities of it for years to come. We do not now produce all the wheat of which we are capable. There is still land left which will produce wheat, and although this land, or much of it, will not grow wheat profitably with low prices, it will produce a large amount of wheat if the owners are assured that the price will remain high enough to make it profitable. This applies not only to land which is at present owned by private individuals, but also to considerable public land still remaining. Most of the increase in our wheat production, however, must come from increased yields rather than from increase of acreage. More intensive cultivation will increase the yield per acre, and with the increase in price which will follow the overtaking of our production by our consumption, such intensive cultivation will be brought about. tariff on wheat is removed, however, such improved cultivation of our wheat lands will be delayed. Agriculture is an industry of diminishing returns; after a certain point in the cultiva-tion of land has been reached, although additional cultivation will increase the yield, each additional unit of crop so produced will cost more in capital and labor expended than did the preceding units. Consequently, those additional units will not be produced until the price received for the product has reached such a point that it will be profitable to expend this additional amount of capital and labor in producing them. With our markets thrown open to Canadian wheat, the production of which is less expensive than that of most American wheat, the price will be prevented by the Canadian wheat from reaching the level making it profitable to raise the additional bushels per acre.

It is perhaps not absolutely necessary, in order to bring about this increased production, to retain the tariff and thus increase the price of wheat. If the tariff is removed from all articles imported from all countries, the cost of the articles that the farmer buys will be lessened, and the production of the additional bushels per acre may be brought about by lessening the cost of production instead of by increasing the price of the product.

If the farmer is to continue to suffer under the disadvantages of buying in a protected market, however, and yet be compelled to compete with the Canadian farmer, we shall be importing wheat from Canada for our own consumption within a comparatively few years. The fact of the cheaper production of Canadian wheat will operate to draw American capital and labor into the Canadian Northwest even at a more rapid rate than has been the case these last few years. It would seem

that no proof is required of the proposition that older lands can not compete with newer, more productive lands in producing wheat. It may be instructive, however, to compare the yields of the Canadian wheat fields with those of our own. The average yield of the Canadian wheat fields in 1909 was 211 bushels per acre. The average yield of the United States in 1909 was 15.8 bushels per acre. The average yield of Minnesota was 16.8; of North Dakota, 13.7; of South Dakota, 14.1; of Kansas, 14.5. For the sake of comparison I use the figures of 1909, as the average yield of the Canadian fields in 1910 is not available, and the year 1910 was an abnormal one in many of our grain States, the average yield falling to 5 bushels per acre in North Dakota. The value of farm lands in the great grain-producing Provinces of Canada are given as follows for the year 1909: Manitoba, \$28.94 per acre; Saskatchewan, \$21.54 per acre; Alberta, \$20.46 per acre. It is safe to say that equally productive land can not be bought for those prices in the United States. The cheaper land and its greater productiveness explains why the American farmer can not compete on equal footing with the Canadian farmer, even not taking other factors into consideration. If we, the Republican Members of Congress, are to observe the rule laid down in the Republican platform adopted at Chicago in our tariff legislation that the tariff should be equal to the difference in cost of production at home and abroad, we can not justify ourselves in voting to remove the tariff from the products of the farm unless it is conclusively shown that these duties do not benefit the farmer now and will not benefit him in the future.

The considerations as to the tariff on wheat apply with greater force to the tariff on other farm products. Our yearly flax crop, for instance, has from 1908 until last year ranged from 23,000,000 to 29,000,000 bushels. Last year's crop was 14,116,000 bushels. As we retain for domestic consumption from nineteen to twenty-six million bushels annually, it will easily be seen where the duty on flax is going to affect its price this year. The average yield of flax in 1909 was 15.98 bushels to the acre in Canada and 9.4 bushels in the United States. I do not mean to assert that the difference in favor of the Canadian flax grower is always as great as this. The yield of flax will vary more from year to year than that of wheat, and I do not have the figures for a series of years.

In 1910 the average yield of flax in the United States was 4.8 bushels per acre. I have not been able to obtain the figures as to the Canadian yield for that year. It is evident that the cost of raising a bushel of flaxseed is greater in the United States than it is in Canada. The duty on flax under the Payne Tariff Act is 25 cents per bushel. This certainly did not cover the difference in cost of production in 1909, and according to the principle composited in the Chicago platform of 1000 in the principle composited in the Chicago platform of 1000 in the Principle of the ciple enunciated in the Chicago platform of 1908, instead of removing this duty, it ought to be increased. It will affect the price of flax this year, and its removal can not be excused on the ground that it has no effect on the price and is therefore of no benefit to the farmer. In normal years North Dakota produces about three-fifths of all the flax produced in this country. In 1909 North Dakota's flax crop had a value of \$22,340,000. In 1910 the crop was estimated to have a value of \$13,578,000. we remove the duty, we shall reduce the value of this crop by an amount depending on the amount of flax that Canada raised last year.

I shall not take up the other crops separately. It is enough to say that the cost of producing each is less on the new lands in Canada than it is on lands which have been cropped for a number of years in the United States. I wish to insert here a newspaper clipping, showing how the farmers of western Canada view the agreement, which I send to the Secretary's desk and ask to have read.

The Secretary read as follows:

PARMERS FOR RECIPROCITY—AGREEMENT WELCOMED IN WESTERN CANADA, SAYS SPOKESMAN—OPENING UP OF MARKETS, IT IS ASSERTED, WILL CLEAR WAY FOR THE RAISING OF NEW CROPS.

OTTAWA, ONTARIO, February 25.

"As far as the reciprocity agreement goes, it has the complete approval of the western farmers, but dissatisfaction is expressed at the smallness of the reduction in the duty on agricultural implements."

This was the statement to-day of James Bower, president of the Canadian National Council of Agriculture and of the United Farmers of Alberta, who is in Ottawa to urge the Government to grant in full the demands made by the farmers' delegation of December 15.

"If, however," said Mr. Bower, "the contention of some is correct, that the agreement is but the first step toward breaking down the whole system of protection, the farmers may well hail it with unqualified satisfaction.

"By opening up new markets the agreement would, without question, give a great impetus to the agricultural industry, particularly in western Canada, and would prove equally advantageous to the farmers of eastern Canada, especially in dairy products and hay.

"The antireciprocity speakers are absolutely wrong as to how it would affect western farming conditions. Take barley, for instance, Western Canada is particularly well adapted to growing barley, but for lack of a market none has been grown except for home consumption.

Now, with the prospect of a market, we could engage in growing the crop, which is most suitable to our natural conditions, and with the assurance of competition in the cattle trade and an outside market for our stock the cattle trade would receive a wonderful stimulus.

"But perhaps the greatest boon reciprocity would confer upon the farmers of the West would be its indirect results in reducing freight rates, which would mean increased production all along the line. This would, of course, mean a greater demand for manufactured articles in the West, and a greater ability to pay for them."

Mr. CRONNAL It has been averaged that the free admission of

Mr. GRONNA. It has been argued that the free admission of Canadian grains will benefit the farmer because the Canadian wheat will not be shipped to Liverpool to break the market there, but will be shipped to the United States with its greater markets, where it will be stored and absorbed and later shipped gradually to Liverpool, steadying our own markets by steadying the Liverpool market, and that the American grain grower will thus secure control of the marketing of the Canadian grain as well as his own, and will consequently control the market to a fuller extent than he now does. How seriously this argument is taken by those who advance it is something that I have not been able to discover. It would seem that it is needless to call anyone's attention to the fact that shipping 50,000,000 or 100,000,000 bushels of wheat into Minneapolis or Chicago is not going to give the American grain grower any control of the market. The American grain grower is not going to buy Canadian wheat. I believe that it is quite enough to ask him to share the American market with the Canadian wheat grower without expecting him also to buy the wheat of his competitor. I do not say that the Canadian wheat will not be bought after it has been shipped to our terminal markets and perhaps held for a while before being shipped to Liverpool or being ground into flour; I do say that it will not be the American grain grower that does this. farmer does not as a rule speculate in his own products; he is quite content if he can secure a reasonable price for his products, and he is not going to buy foreign wheat and haul it to his own granary and keep it there for two, three, or four months in order to steady the Liverpool market, strange as this may seem to certain gentlemen. I also wish to make another statement in this connection, which I do not believe anyone will dispute, and that is that the persons who do buy this Canadian wheat will not do it for the purpose of increasing the price that the American farmer will get for his wheat, and that the result of the trading in Canadian wheat will not be to increase the price paid the American farmer. It is a decidedly novel and unique theory that the price of wheat can be raised by throwing increased supplies on our own markets.

The ratification of this agreement has been urged on the ground that the reduction of duties on farm products will decrease the high cost of living, and I have no doubt that many people who have not examined its provisions are under the impression that this would result. There is one noticeable thing about this agreement, however, to which I called attention at the opening of my speech, and that is that while the farmer's products are to be admitted free, the food products manufac-tured from these still pay a duty. Wheat is free, but flour pays tured from these still pay a duty. Wheat is free, but flour pays a duty of 50 cents a barrel. Cattle are free, but meats pay a duty of 11 cents per pound. We are to admit oats free, but oatmeal pays a duty of 50 cents a hundred. Barley is free, but pearled barley pays a duty of 50 cents a hundred. Aside from fish—which is to be admitted free at the cost of the New England fisherman—fresh vegetables, fruits, dairy products, eggs, honey, and salt, the consumer will find nothing that he can eat on the free list.

It is a well-known fact that most people do not eat live animals, and they will therefore buy their meat from the protected beef trust; they do not eat wheat, and when they come to purchase flour they find a duty of 50 cents a barrel on it; they do not eat oats, and their breakfast oatmeal is assessed a duty of 50 cents a hundred. Poultry may be eaten dead or alive with-out paying a duty. It is grim humor to pretend to lower the cost of living by lowering the duties on the raw materials, which the consumer does not buy, and retaining the duties on the finished products which he does buy. I do not know that anyone has ever seriously charged that the farmers get too high prices for their products or that they exact too high prices and are to blame for the high cost of living, and removing the duties on their products is certainly not going to reduce the cost to the consumer so long as the manufactured product is protected.

The farmers who are asked to share their markets with the Canadian farmers will derive no benefit from this agreement.

It opens no new markets to them, and it reduces the duties on practically nothing that they buy. It is true that certain kinds of lumber is to be admitted free, but it is unplaned lumber, the kind that the farmer and other consumers of lumber do not buy and do not use. We do not export wheat, or oats, or barley, or flaxseed, or the other products of the farm to Canada, and we never shall. Canada will be exporting these

products long after we have ceased to produce more than enough for our own consumption. It is noticeable that the few manufactures from which the duties have been removed, outside of rough lumber, print paper, and wood pulp, are those of which we never have imported any appreciable quantities from Canada and in all probability never shall. It is evident that whatever interests may derive benefit from this agreement, the only ones to suffer will be the farmers, fishermen, and producers of raw materials. Ample provision seems to have been made against any manufacturing industry being injured, with the exception of the paper industry, and in the case of this industry it does not appear that their products will be admitted free for some time to come, if ever.

I wish to insert at this point a table prepared by the Bureau of Statistics, showing the exports and imports of Canada to the United States and to the United Kingdom, and also her total exports and imports, which I ask to have made a part of my remarks without being read:

Total imports for consumption into Canada and share thereof from the United States, United Kingdom, and all other countries during the years 1900 and 1905 to 1910.

Years.	Imports from the United States.	Imports from the United Kingdom.	Imports from all other countries.	Total imports.
1900	\$102,080,177	\$44,279,983	\$26,146,718	\$172,506,878
	152,431,626	60,342,704	38,842,789	251,617,119
	168,798,376	69,183,915	45,299,913	283,282,204
	148,598,061	64,415,415	36,724,398	249,737,874
	204,648,885	94,417,314	52,813,756	351,879,955
	170,056,178	70,682,101	47,479,296	288,217,515
	217,502,415	95,336,427	56,976,585	369,815,427

Total exports from Canada and share thereof exported to the United States, United Kingdom, and all other countries during the years 1900 and 1905 to 1910.

Years.	Exports to the United States.	Exports to the United Kingdom.	Exports to all other countries.	Total exports.
1900 1905 1906 1907 1908 1908	\$54,501,394 75,563,015 88,001,309 65,838,636 96,920,138 91,022,387 110,614,327	\$107,735,968 101,958,771 133,092,571 105,929,601 134,477,124 133,745,123 149,630,488	\$15,538,682 23,950,275 25,563,922 21,118,996 31,971,690 35,154,856 38,519,178	\$177,776,044 201,472,061 246,657,202 192,087,203 263,368,952 259,922,366 298,763,993

Figures for the years 1900, 1905, and 1906 are for the fiscal years ending June 30 of the years stated.

Figures for the year 1907 are for the nine months ending March 31 of that year, owing to the fact that the Canadian Government changed the fiscal year from ending June 30 to ending March 31.

Figures for the years 1908, 1909, and 1910 are for the fiscal years ending March 31 of the years stated.

Data taken from the Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce of Canada for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1910, Part I.

BUREAU OF STATISTICS,
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

This table shows that our exports to Canada increased from \$102,060,177 in 1900 to \$217,500,000 in 1910, and that our imports from Canada increased from \$54,500,000 in 1900 to \$110,600,000 in 1910. It does not appear that our commerce with Canada was in such a languishing state that it was necessary to negotiate such a one-sided agreement as this in order to revive it. of her total imports in 1910 Canada took almost 60 per cent from the United States, and of her exports during the same year we took considerably less than 40 per cent. Is it to be presumed that our commerce with Canada will be more favorable to us in case this agreement should be ratified in its present form? I believe not, viewed as a whole. It is possible that there may be certain interests whose products will enter Canada more easily and which will, therefore, reap benefits from this agreement, but it will be at the expense of other producers.

This agreement was negotiated in the dark. We have been furnished with no information as to what considerations led our representatives to insist on certain reductions of duties or to grant others. We have not been informed what facts, if any, they considered in determining which industries should be favored and which should not be. The more the agreement is examined the less favorably is one impressed with tariff revision by executive order. The agreement has come before us under conditions which make it impossible to secure the many changes which would be necessary to make it an arrangement beneficial to this country. One can not escape the conclusion that it is the result of hasty and ill-considered action, and we are tempted to ask whether our representatives who agreed to this agreement did not unwittingly enact the rôle of the trusting stranger in the large city.

In its drafting the plain words of the Chicago platform, in accordance with which it is pretended to have been formulated, are ignored, and the plain facts of present industrial conditions are disregarded. A few industries are to be aided to extend their markets into Canada, and in order to do this the interests of the American farmer are to be sacrified. The only consolation offered the farmer is that he has been so badly treated in the past whenever tariff legislation has been enacted that he can stand a little more at this time and not feel it very much. The dissatisfaction which arose from the inequalities and injustices of the tariff law of 1909 is used as an excuse for perpetrating further injustice. In this partial tariff revision the duties attacked are the very ones with which there has been no dissatisfaction, as their effect in the past has been almost negligible so far as the price of the products is concerned, and entirely so, so far as the cost of the articles manufactured from them is concerned.

The Chicago platform demanded that the difference in cost of production at home and abroad should be the measure of protection in every instance. This agreement, in effect a revision of certain selected duties, makes no attempt to base its reduction on this principle. Instead of doing so, it removes many duties which do not cover the difference in cost of production, and does not change, or changes only very slightly,

duties far in excess of this difference.

The one crying need at the time of the revision of the tariff in 1909 was the lack of reliable, authoritative, and accurate information as to what duties would be just and reasonable on the different articles. If there is one thing for which the country has pronounced it is for a commission to obtain facts and data on which future tariff acts may be constructed, and if there is one thing which the people of this country do not want, it is a tariff constructed by guesswork. We have at present a board that is gathering facts and data as to the cost of production at home and abroad, and we expect to vote hundreds of thousands of dollars for it to continue its work. Yet, we have a tariff schedule drawn up for us and presented to us with the request and implied threat that we must make it law, without any facts justifying the different rates being presented, and with the tariff board, on which everybody relied, apparently having been entirely ignored. It would appear that the ra-tional way to revise the tariff would be to secure the information necessary to effect a scientific revision, before undertaking to change any duties, except in cases of urgent need or where everybody admitted that the duties were too high. Having obtained this information, if it were a question of which rates to change first, it would seem that the ones to select would be the ones the retention of which worked a hardship on the con-sumer. The course pursued in this instance has been exactly With no attempt apparent to discover the effect the opposite. of the proposed changes, evidently with no facts available bearing on them, seemingly with nothing else as a guide than a desire to reduce and remove some duties on Canadian products, the duties selected are the very ones which everybody agreed could well afford to wait until the last for revision, as their effects in the past have been negligible, they are not onerous at present, and there is no danger of any trusts or combinations forming behind them to force prices up to unreasonable levels.

It has been hinted that this has been done in retaliation for the criticism bestowed upon the tariff act of 1909. I do not believe that this is so, and I sincerely hope that it is not. I did not consider the 1909 tariff act equitable, but this partial tariff

revision is more unjust than that act was.

The farmers, the very class who have in the past derived the least benefit from protection, are singled out as the ones to be deprived of whatever benefits they might derive from it in the future. The farmer does not ask for any special favors, but he does demand justice in the making of tariff laws as well as in the making of other laws. If we are to change our policy and adopt free trade, he can perhaps better afford to do this than any other class, but he will demand that it be free trade for all, and not merely free trade for him and protection for all the other industries. If we are to retain the protective policy, he will demand that any benefits that might lie in protective duties on his products be accorded him just as readily as it has in the past been to other industries. I warn Senators that the ratification of as unjust an agreement as this will have its inevitable effects. If the farmer must sell his products in competition with all the world, he will enforce his demand that he be permitted to buy his goods in the world's markets, and in the industrial convulsions which will accompany a sudden change of industrial policy, it will be found that the farmer will suffer less than the person engaged in any other industry.

I am in favor of more liberal trade agreements, not only with Canada, but with all countries. In the making of these agreements, however, it is essential that all industries are given a square deal, and that one industry is not benefited at the expense of another. I will not support an agreement which gives the brewing interests cheaper barley at the expense of the farmer, gives the Milling Trust cheaper wheat at the expense of the farmer, benefits the Meat Trust at the expense of the farmer, and aims to extend the market of the Steel Trust at the expense of the farmer. Neither do I intend to vote to sacrifice the interests of the farmer in order to add to the earnings of the railway magnates of the Northwest, whose millions are made up of the forced contributions of the farmers, and who are now engaged in applying epithets to those who feel that the interests of the farmer is deserving of consideration.

It is no more fair to make an agreement of this kind than it would be to admit all the cotton manufactures free of duty from England and Germany while retaining the duties on farm products and all other manufactures. It has not been shown how the ratification of this agreement will benefit anyone in this country, with the exception of a few large manufacturing interests and certain railways, and it is apparent that the farmer will have to pay the cost.

The name reciprocity attached to this agreement is misleading. When Canada demanded the opening of our markets to her farm products she knew, and we ought to have known, that she was giving very little in return for what she was getting. The reciprocity that Blaine espoused did not contemplate the admission of foreign goods in competition with ours; the cardinal principle of it was the extension of our foreign markets by the removal of duties on goods which we did not produce ourselves and which would therefore not compete with American products. The reciprocity for which the late President McKinley pleaded aimed at the extension of our foreign markets by the removal of such of our duties as were no longer needed to encourage our own industries. Neither of them aimed at the extension of the market of one industry by sacrificing another industry. I can not find that the principle on which this agreement must have been based has anything in common with those enunciated by Blaine and McKinley. I believe that the era of high tariffs is past; I believe that the American producer will in the future have to content himself with a tariff equal only to the difference in cost of production at home and abroad. It is possible that in their present temper the American people will go farther even than this. While part of this may be brought about by wisely and justly drawn reciprocity agreements, I am inclined to believe that more will be brought about by tariff laws applying to all countries alike and discriminating against no country not treating us unfairly. But whatever tariff policy we may pursue, it is essential that in applying it we treat all industries and sections fairly, and do not discriminate against one in favor of another.

SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS.

The Senate resumed the consideration of Senate resolution 315, relative to the right of Mr. LORIMER to a seat in the Senate

from the State of Illinois.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the Senate has been in constant session from yesterday morning until now, with the exception of about three hours. Such a session as last night, with the burdens upon us for the next few days, is too exacting for the human system. It is the father of malaria and grippe and pneumonia, and so far as I am concerned I shall not ask the Senate to repeat last night's performance.

I do not think it would advantage the public business; I do not think last night's session advantaged the public business; but to-morrow, Mr. President, I shall ask the Senate to take up appropriation bills, and I shall ask the Senate at 5 o'clock or half past 5 o'clock to take a recess, not for such a session as that of last night, but for actual business and the disposal of appropriation bills. It need not be a prolonged, drawn-out, exciting session; but three or four hours spent on appropriation bills will be a profitable investment of the time of the Senate.

There is no reason, Mr. President, why by a reasonable hour, after a reasonable recess, the Senate can not to-morrow pass the agricultural appropriation bill, the Post Office appropriation bill, the counsular and diplematic appropriation bill, the fortifications appropriation bill, and the Military Academy appropriation bill, and get them out of the way, leaving the great appropriation bills for the last two or three days for the Senate

I can not have my way about this, Mr. President. I do not know what has been done and I do not know what trafficking has been done; I do not know but that there is some other program that is better than this. I shall feel, however, if this can not be carried out, that I have at least presented it to the Senate, with a view of the waning length of the session and the fact that Saturday noon, only four days away, stands before

us as the end of everything that is to be done. Unless something is done in the way, first, of passing these appropriation bills and getting them out of the road and into conference, later we may not be able to properly consider the larger appropriation bills, which are full of controversies.

I have been appalled, Mr. President, as I have studied the great sundry civil appropriation bill and the naval appropriation bill, carrying together nearly \$300,000,000, and full of proposi-tions and measures—I say "measures" included in the appropriation bill-that will necessarily involve controversy and discussion. I am appalled as I have been attempting with the clerks to get the sundry civil bill in readiness, so that we may report it later. It has never been so formidable as it is this year sent to us; it never has been so large. It comprises over 230 pages, bristling from the first clause to the last with every possible kind of provision that arouses interest, and confronts objection and controversy,

The naval bill is no better; and the final deficiency appropriation bill is different from any other deficiency bill that we have had of late years. It has been the fashion here to put on most of the items pertaining to such a bill at an early day on the urgent deficiency appropriation bill. That was not done this

year; and the general deficiency is the cleaning-up bill.

I want to-morrow to be given to the consideration of the other bills I have named that we have got to get out of the way. As I have said, I shall not ask the Senate to stay here to-night for any proposition. If it does stay it will do so, so far as I am concerned, without any suggestion on my part. Neither do I think it will be good tactics in the way of setting forward the public business. I am sure it will not be for the benefit of the Senate in its condition and in its capacity for work in the succeeding days of the session. Mr. BAILEY. Now, Mr. Pr

Now, Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine permit an inquiry?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. HALE. Certainly. I am going to make a motion, but I will yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Before the Senator submits the motion I simply want to inquire if it is the Senator's opinion, in view of the statement he has made, that the appropriation bills must fail unless the Senate can address itself to them within a reasonable time?

Mr. HALE. I have no doubt whatever about that, Mr. President. We are going to have very hard work to get them through, anyway, and we are likely to be confronted with another condition as to these great bills. The Senator the other day made a suggestion that I have heard very many times since. Certain authorities, and good authorities, in the other House insist that the popular branch, which comes from the people, instead of this declining Congress, ought to make up the supply bills for the next session; that it should make up the naval bill, the Post Office bill, the sundry civil bill, and the pension bill; that that branch represents the last verdict of the people; that there are no subjects of such importance as the framing of the supply bills; and that that work, instead of being done by a declining and discredited, as they call it, Congress, shall be done by the new organization. We have got to meet that difficulty, Mr. President, and it will grow all the

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. HALE. Certainly; I will yield for any suggestion.

Mr. BURROWS. With a view of facilitating the purpose which the Senator from Maine has in mind, of early action upon appropriation bills and other matters, I am constrained to ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, to-morrow, at 1.30 o'clock, the vote be taken upon Senate resolution No. 315 without further debate.

Mr. HALE. What resolution is that?

Mr. BURROWS. The resolution in reference to the election of Mr. LORIMER.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is the unfinished business. The Senator from Michigan asks unanimous consent that on tomorrow, Wednesday, at 1.30 o'clock, without further debate, the vote be taken upon Senate resolution 315, known as the Lorimer resolution.

Mr. HALE. Now, Mr. President, as the Senator puts that, it can only occupy the time of the Senate to be consumed by a single roll call. But I am not so unreasonable as to insist upon my program when it is only to be varied so little by what will dispose of a controverted question, if no Senator objects to that proposition and everybody is in favor of it. Let me ask the

Senator whether this is going to be supplemented by some other proposition that will take time?

Mr. BURROWS. I do not know about that.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator yield to a motion for a

Mr. HALE. No; I certainly do not intend to vote for a recess to-night.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request

for unanimous consent?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan and Mr. BEVERIDGE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine has the floor.

Mr. HALE. I will ask that the proposition be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will again state the proposition, which is that at 1.30 o'clock to-morrow, Wednesday, vote be taken, without further debate, upon resolution No. 315, known as the Lorimer resolution.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I would like to have it understood, if that is agreed to, that no effort will be made this even-

ing to take up any other measure.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, as soon as this talk has ceased I propose to move that the Senate adjourn; that nothing be taken up this evening.

Mr. KEAN. Why not take a recess and allow the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Owen] to speak to-night?

Mr. HALE. Unless the Senate overrules me, I will not consent to a night session, and Senators ought not, after last night's experience, to ask anybody to come here to-night.

Mr. STONE. I certainly have not any objection to the re quest for unanimous consent if it is understood that there will

be no other business taken up to-night.

Mr. HALE. So far as I am concerned, unless the Senate decides otherwise, I shall move to adjourn, because I do not think as I have said—and I hate to repeat myself—it is good management, and I do not think it is good tactics.

Mr. STONE. Then, if the Senator will permit me, I consent, or, rather, I do not object to the request for unanimous consent, with the understanding, in good faith, that no effort will be made and no motion made to take up any other proposition tonight or lay it before the Senate.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. President, I would say to the Senator from Missouri that, upon unanimous consent being granted to my request, I propose to ask that the Senate take a recess until o'clock-

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, then I shall object. Mr. BURROWS (continuing). When the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Owen] desires to address the Senate.

Mr. HALE. I shall object to any session to-night.
Mr. BAILEY. The Senator does not object to the request for unanimous consent, but only to the recess?
Mr. HALE. I do, if there is to be a recess.
Mr. OWEN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maine yield

to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I will not object if a proposition is to be made to take a recess until 8 o'clock this evening, no other matter to be taken up except the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma at the evening session.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President-

Mr. HALE. I understand that it is the proposition that noth-

ing but that shall be taken up.

Mr. BURROWS. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]
has been waiting for several days to address the Senate.

Mr. HALE. I am willing—
Mr. OWEN. I think the matter might be easily adjusted by adjourning now, as the Senator from Maine desires, until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, and permitting me then to address the Senate. I shall not take very long. I do not expect to make a prolonged speech.

Mr. HALE. I do not object to that.

Mr. BURROWS. Does the Senator from Maine object to the other proposition for a recess?

Mr. HALE. I do.

Mr. BURROWS. And nothing else to be taken up?

Mr. HALE. Yes; I do, unless it is settled that no business shall be transacted except speeches. I do not object to the proposition of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Owen], though I do not think we need to meet before half past 10 to-morrow.

Mr. PENROSE. I suggest that the Senate continue in session.

Mr. BURROWS. Let us come to an understanding about this matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan, as stated by the Chair?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The year and nays having been ordered on the unfinished business, I understand no business can come before the Senate until that order is vacated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is in error as to that. Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Let us see whether I am in error.

The VICE PRESIDENT. But the Chair rules that the Sena-

tor is in error.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. But I should like to make my point. This is the point I desire to make: The yeas and nays having been ordered on the pending question, as I understand the rule it will not be possible to consider appropriation bills with that order pending. Am I in error about that?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan is in

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, the opinion of the Chair-it not being a decision at this time—would be promptly and rather vigorously contested. But that is a mere academic question

The VICE PRESIDENT. That question has not been raised. The Chair made the statement in answer to a parliamentary

inquiry.

Mr. BAILEY. I think that with a question of the highest privilege pending, and the yeas and nays ordered on it, the demand for the regular order brings that up at any time and against any other matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Oh, yes; but that was not the

inquiry propounded to the Chair.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That was the inquiry I was en-deavoring to make. Perhaps I did not make myself clear.

Mr. BAILEY. That was the thing I had in mind.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. What I had in my mind was whether, if we vote to adjourn until to-morrow on the motion of the Senator from Maine, and then unanimous consent is given to vote on the Lorimer resolution at 1.30 p. m., the session in the morning, up to the time of voting, could be occupied by the consideration of an appropriation bill to the exclusion any other business?

Mr. HALE. If the Senate so voted, undoubtedly.
The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senate so voted at a time
when the motion could be put, yes.
Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That would be in the control of the

Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And would be debatable?

Mr. KEAN. No.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; a motion to proceed to the consideration of an appropriation bill or other matter is not debatable.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I desire to say that some of us have listened very patiently to discussion of the pending case which is about to be decided. I have not thus far said a word regarding it, and may not do so to-morrow, although I do not want to be foreclosed by this arrangement. I am unwilling to give my consent that a vote may be taken upon this matter unless the utmost freedom of discussion within the time allowed shall be permitted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It remains with the Senate tomorrow morning to determine whether it desires to debate the

matter further or not.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, upon the assurance—and I am in the habit of taking the word of fellow Senators—that nothing will be done this evening, except discussion and the making of speeches, that no vote will be had, instead of moving—to-morrow will take care of itself—that the Senate adjourn, I will move that it take a recess until 8 o'clock this evening, and that when the Senate adjourn to-day, it be to meet at half past 10 to-morrow morning. There are three or four committees that want to have meetings about very important appropriation bills.

Mr. CULLOM (to Mr. HALE). Make it 11 o'clock.

Mr. HALE. The Senator from Illinois suggests 11 o'clock. Mr. CULLOM. I make that suggestion because I have an important committee meeting.

Mr. HALE. Then I will move that when the Senate adjourns

to-day, it be to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator desire to make that motion before the request for unanimous consent is disposed of?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. By no manner of means. Let us have the unanimous consent agreement first. The motion is made, and that takes precedence.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was attempting to understand from the Senator who had the floor, if the Senator from Indiana will permit the Chair to do so, what his intention was. The Chair was undertaking to understand what the Senator from Maine wanted to do.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I was trying myself to understand it. The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thought he had a right to understand, so that he could put the motion. The Chair still thinks so.

Mr. HALE. I move, first, that when the Senate adjourns to-day—at the suggestion of the Senator from Illinois and the chairmen of other committees—that it be to meet to-morrow at I shall follow that by a motion for recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine moves that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow. [Putting the question.]

Mr. CARTER and others addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is not debatable.

Mr. CARTER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.
Mr. CARTER. Was the request for unanimous consent, as stated by the Chair, acceded to by the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was not. It has not yet been acceded to.

Mr. CARTER. I ask the Chair if any objection was interposed; and if so, by whom?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No objection has yet been interposed, but the Senator from Maine had stated, as the Chair understood, that until this other motion was put, he would not accede to the request. Did the Chair correctly understand the

Senator from Maine?

Mr. HALE. The Chair is entirely correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine.

The motion was agreed to.
The VICE PRESIDENT. Now, the Chair will put the other request, if Senators will permit.

Mr. HALE. Yes; that is right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Which is that at 1.30 to-morrow a vote be taken, without further debate, upon Senate resolution 315, known as the Lorimer resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

Mr. HALE. I hope if Senators are going to object, instead of arguing the case, they will object. We ought to know where we are.

Mr. STONE. I do not intend to argue it, although I might do so, following the example of my distinguished friend, the Senator from Maine, when he was on the floor.

Mr. HALE. I have not argued anything; I am trying to do

business.

Mr. STONE. I do not mean to argue it. I desire to say again that I have no objection whatever to agreeing to vote on the Lorimer case at 1.30 to-morrow, with the understanding that no other business, save speech making, such as has been indicated, will be transacted until the Senate meets at 11 o'clock to-morrow

Mr. HALE. That assurance has been given to me, so that I am entirely satisfied.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As thus modified—
Mr. CUMMINS. I do not so understand the situation. not know of any arrangement or agreement by which if the Senate meets at 8 o'clock it is limited to speech making.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. There is none.
Mr. CUMMINS. I certainly would not accede to any such suggestion as that. When the Senate comes together it can do

as it pleases.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Except as to a matter about which it had made an agreement. Of course that would have to be voted upon at the hour agreed upon. It could be voted upon neither before nor later. Is there objection?

Mr. STONE. Now, what is the request?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request is that at 1.30 to-mor-

row, without further debate, a vote be taken upon Senate resolu-

tion 315. Is there objection?

Mr. STONE. I said I would not object if it is modified as I indicated—that no other business, except the making of speeches, in case of a recess, shall be transacted prior to 11 o'clock to-morrow, the hour to which the Senate has agreed to adjourn. Mr. CARTER. Mr. President-

Mr. HALE. I think nobody will object to that.

Mr. CARTER. I inquire whether it is the understanding of the Senator that no business will be transacted during the remainder of the session after the recess-that is, during the

Mr. HALE. That is the understanding.

Mr. CARTER. And the question of the time at which the recess shall be taken is still, of course, in the hands of the Senate.

Mr. STONE. I do not quite understand.
Mr. CARTER. Of course there will be a remnant of the session which will convene after the recess at 8 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to make a statement to the Senate. It was the intention of the Chair to recognize some Senator, if this agreement were made, to move to take up some matter, which should be the unfinished business of the Senate.

Mr. STONE. That is what I supposed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not wish the Senate to misunderstand the Chair. Senators can agree to whatever they choose, certainly. But the Chair thought he ought to tell the Senate what his intention was.

Mr. CARTER. I desire to know whether I correctly understand the request of the Senator from Missouri for a modification. Is it that if a recess is taken until 8 o'clock no business shall be transacted after 8 o'clock and before adjournment except the making of speeches?

Mr. HALE. It is.

Mr. CARTER. Is that the full extent of the Senator's request?

Mr. STONE. That there shall be no business transacted.

Mr. CARTER. During the evening session? Mr. STONE. During this session or the evening session at any time prior to 11 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri

yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. STONE. In other words, what I desire to be understood as saying is this: That I think it is the intention of some Senator to move to take up some other bill, probably the tariff commission bill—that is the one I apprehend the motion would apply to—and to make it the unfinished business. I would prefer to have it done when the Senate meets at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. HALE. I think it will speed public business if this consent is given that the vote shall be taken at 1.30 to-morrow, without further debate, and that no business except the making of speeches shall be transacted at the evening session.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Do not put in that last request. The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CUMMINS. I object to that.
Mr. PENROSE. I object, Mr. President.
Mr. CUMMINS. I do not object to the request as preferred by the Senator from Michigan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the request which was stated by the Chair.

Mr. CUMMINS. The request, as I understood, as modified by the suggestion of the Senator from Maine, however, was

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has not been asked to put any modified request. The Chair has simply put the request that the Chair was asked to put. Is there objection to that request?

Mr. LODGE. Will the Chair restate the request?

Mr. CUMMINS. Yes; restate it.
The VICE PRESIDENT. It is that at 1.30 to-morrow, without further debate, a vote be taken upon Senate resolution 315.

Mr. STONE. Does the Chair think it proper to couple first

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will couple anything that he is requested to couple. He has not yet been requested to couple anything.

Mr. STONE. I will prefer the request to the Chair to amend that request to this effect—with the understanding that no business will be transacted during this session or the recess session this evening.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Before adjournment to-day covers it.

Mr. HALE. Yes. Mr. STONE. Well, before adjournment to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will again put the request-that at 1.30 to-morrow a vote be taken, without further debate, upon Senate resolution 315, and that during the session of to-day-this legislative day-no business other than debate be transacted.

Mr. CUMMINS. I must object to that.
Mr. PENROSE, I object to the latter part of that proposed agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. PENROSE. I withdraw my objection. I misunderstood the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa objected. Mr. CUMMINS. I desire to be understood in the matter.
The Senator from Maine withdrew his motion to adjourn so that a motion could be made to proceed to the consideration of any other business that it may be thought wise to take up and have that matter determined now. I will not object to confining the session this evening to addresses made by Senators who desire to address the Senate.

Mr. HALE. I am willing to leave that entirely to the Senate. For the present I withdraw my motion for a recess this

evening.

Mr. STONE. The motion that when we adjourn to-day it

be to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request as stated by the Chair, or does the Senator from Iowa request some modification of it?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President-

Mr. HALE. The Senator, as I understood it, asked me to

withdraw my request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks he can state it as he understands the Senator from Iowa to request it—that at 1.30 to-morrow, without further debate, a vote be taken upon Senate resolution 315; that after the taking of a recess this afternoon no business be transacted prior to adjournment on this legislative day other than addresses.

Mr. KEAN. Except a motion to—
Mr. CUMMINS. I do object to the combined request. I

state again my position.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was trying to state

what the Senator requested.

Mr. CUMMINS. If the request made by the Senator from Michigan can be put without any accompaniment I shall not object to it, and if then a motion can be entertained to proceed to the consideration of some other matter which the Senate may desire to take up— Mr. HALE. What other matter?

Mr. CUMMINS. And that motion is disposed of, I will not then object to the request made by the Senator from Missouri that the evening session be devoted to addresses.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Exclusively to addresses.

Mr. LODGE. If the request of the Senator from Michigan had been agreed to as he made it, without additions, it was my intention to move to proceed to the consideration of the tariff-commission bill. If that motion should be adopted, I should

then make no objection, and I do not think anyone else would, to confining the rest of the day to speeches and addresses.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Massachusetts has stated

in terms the matter I had in mind.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will again put the request.

Mr. HALE. Let me suggest that both Senators can not make that motion.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have not attempted to make any motion.

I simply made an objection to the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the original request of the Senator from Michigan that at 1.30 to-morrow, without further debate, the Senate take a vote upon Senate resolution 315?

Mr. STONE. I prefer a request of this kind: That the vote be taken at the time indicated, at 1.30 to-morrow, and that as soon as that consent of the Senate is obtained the motion which the Senator proposes to offer may be made to-night, and then the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will put it that way. The Senator from Missouri asks unanimous consent to modify the request of the Senator from Michigan-

Will the Senator from Missouri state the Mr. CUMMINS.

request?

Mr. LODGE. The Chair was about to state it. It is that at 1.30 to-morrow, without further debate, the Senate take a vote on Senate resolution 315; that following the entering into of this agreement the Chair recognize some person to move to consider some other bill; and that when that motion is carried the Senate take a recess until 8 o'clock-did the Senator say?

Mr. STONE. Eleven o'clock. Mr. BAILEY. We have all

Mr. BAILEY. We have already agreed that when we adjourn it be until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has been agreed that when the Senate adjourns it be until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning. Is

there objection? The Chair hears none, and that order is entered.

TARIFF BOARD.

I move that the Senate proceed to the Mr. BEVERIDGE. sideration of the bill (H. R. 32010) to create a tariff board.

Mr. BAILEY. On that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I notice that the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] is absent. So I withhold my vote, having a general pair with him. Were he present, I would vote "yea."

Mr. FLINT (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. Culberson]. He being absent, I will withhold my vote. If he were present, I would

vote "yea."

Mr. OVERMAN (when Mr. TALIAFERRO'S name was called). I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. Taliaferro] is unavoidably absent and that he is paired with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SCOTT]. If the Senator from Florida were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. BACON (when Mr. Terrell's name was called). again announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. Terrell] on account of personal illness. I understand that he is paired with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Aldrich]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."
Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I have a stand-

ing pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Money],

and I therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded. Mr. BACON (after having voted in the negative). I inquire whether the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. Frye] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. BACON. I have a pair with that Senator. In his absence

withdraw my vote.

Mr. BAILEY. Perhaps it is shown by the announcement of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]; but in case it is not, I desire the RECORD to show that if the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Tillman] were present he would vote "nay."

The result was announced-yeas 54, nays 21, as follows:

	Y	EAS-54.	
Beveridge Bourne Bradley Brandegee Briggs Bristow Brown Bulkeley Burkett Burnham Burrows Burton Carter Chamberlain	Clapp Clark, Wyo. Crane Crawford Cullom Cummins Curtis Depew Dick Dixon du Pont Gallinger Gamble Gronna	Guggenheim Hale Jones Kean La Follette Lodge Lorimer McCumber Nelson Newlands Nixon Oliver Owen Page	Penrose Perkins Piles Richardson Root Smith, Mich Smoot Stephenson Sutherland Warner Wetmore Young
Chamberan		AYS-21.	
Bailey Bankhead Clarke, Ark. Davis Fletcher Foster	Gore Johnston Martin Overman Paynter Percy	Rayner Shively Simmons Smith, Md. Smith, S. C. Swanson	Taylor Thornton Watson
	NOT	VOTING—16.	
Aldrich Bacon Bradley Culberson	Dillingham Flint Frazier Frye	Heyburn Money Scott Stone	Taliaferro Terrell Tillman Warren

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 1, 1911, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Tuesday, February 28, 1911.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D. The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was approved.

CANCELLATION OF SIGNATURE TO JOINT RESOLUTION.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces the cancellation of his signature to Senate joint resolution 145, providing for the filling of the vacancy which will occur on March 1, 1911, in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress, in accordance with the order of the House.